

Contiguous Boundary Guarding

Ahmad Biniiaz* Anil Maheshwari† Joseph S. B. Mitchell‡ Saeed Odak§
 Valentin Polishchuk¶ Thomas Shermer||

December 20, 2024

Abstract

We study the problem of guarding the boundary of a simple polygon with a minimum number of guards such that each guard covers a contiguous portion of the boundary. First, we present a simple greedy algorithm for this problem that returns a guard set of size at most $\text{OPT} + 1$, where OPT is the number of guards in an optimal solution. Then, we present a polynomial-time exact algorithm. While the algorithm is not complicated, its correctness proof is rather involved. This result is interesting in the sense that guarding problems are typically NP-hard and, in particular, it is NP-hard to minimize the number of guards to see the boundary of a simple polygon, without the contiguous boundary guarding constraint.

From the combinatorial point of view, we show that any n -vertex polygon can be guarded by at most $\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor$ guards. This bound is tight because there are polygons that require this many guards.

1 Introduction

The *art gallery problem*, introduced in 1973 by Victor Klee [14, 39], asks for a minimum number of guards that see every point of a given polygon P —the guards can lie anywhere in the polygon.¹ This problem is central to computational geometry and is still an active research area. It has been long known NP-hard [34]; see also [2, 39, 40]. The recent breakthrough result by Abrahamsen, Adamaszek, and Miltzow [1] shows that the problem is $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete² even if the corners of the polygon are at integer coordinates. The problem is notoriously difficult as the best known approximation algorithms have logarithmic factors [11, 18, 19]; see also [20] for some lower bounds on the approximation factor.

The *boundary guarding* is a variant of the art gallery problem in which the goal is to only guard the boundary of P with a minimum number of guards that can lie anywhere in P . One may think of this as guarding only the walls of an art gallery with no sculptures. By extending ideas of [1],

*School of Computer Science, University of Windsor, abiniiaz@uwindsor.ca. Research supported by NSERC.

†School of Computer Science, Carleton University, anil@scs.carleton.ca. Research supported by NSERC.

‡Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics, Stony Brook University, joseph.mitchell@stonybrook.edu. Supported by the National Science Foundation (CCF-2007275).

§School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Ottawa, saeedodak@gmail.com. Research supported by NSERC.

¶Communications and Transport Systems, Linköping Univeristy, valentin.polishchuk@liu.se. Partially supported by the Swedish Transport Administration and the Swedish Research Council.

||School of Computing Science, Simon Fraser University, shermer@sfu.ca. Research supported by NSERC.

¹It is also known as the *point-guard* art gallery problem.

² $\exists\mathbb{R}$ consists of all problems reducible to the decision problem for the existential theory of the reals.

Stade has shown that this variant is also $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete [45]. We introduce the *contiguous* version of this problem. In the *contiguous boundary guarding* problem, the goal is to guard the boundary of P such that each guard covers a contiguous portion of the boundary. While the visibility polygon of a guard may have several connected components on the boundary, the guard is assigned to only one component.

Contiguous boundary guarding is natural, particularly if the guards have a bounded field of view or cannot rotate to cover all visible components on the boundary. This problem appeared in Open Problems from CCCG 2024 [3], motivated by the fact that the hardness proofs for typical art gallery variants [1, 45] require guards to cover several connected components on the boundary. In this paper, we present an exact polynomial-time algorithm and tight combinatorial bounds for the contiguous boundary guarding problem.

1.1 Our results

We study the contiguous boundary guarding problem from combinatorial and computational points of view. In Section 2 we prove that for every integer $n \geq 4$, every n -vertex polygon can be guarded by at most $\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor$ guards. Our proof is constructive, and we show that the bound is the best possible: $\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor$ guards are always sufficient and sometimes necessary.

In Section 4 we present a simple greedy algorithm that returns a guard set of size at most $\text{OPT} + 1$, where OPT is the size of an optimal solution. The algorithm starts from an arbitrary point p on the boundary and then covers the boundary in a counter-clockwise (ccw) direction from p . It places a guard to cover p and a maximal contiguous portion of the boundary in the ccw direction. The algorithm then continues greedily, covering a maximal contiguous boundary portion with each choice of guard, until returning to p . Despite getting very close to optimal by this greedy algorithm, achieving an optimal solution (avoiding an extra guard) is challenging. An interesting property of the greedy algorithm is that if p is covered by two guards in some optimal solution, then the greedy algorithm returns a guard set of size OPT , hence an optimal solution.

In Section 5 we present a polynomial-time exact algorithm for the problem. This algorithm is not complicated, though its correctness proof (presented in Section 6) involves some nontrivial arguments. The main idea is first to find a polynomial-size set S of points on the boundary so that at least one of them is covered by two guards in some optimal solution. Then, we can find an optimal solution by running the greedy algorithm from every point in S . Finding such a set S is the most technical part of the algorithm and the proof.

1.2 Related work and results

The art gallery problem and its variants have been extensively studied. Most of the variants (that arise from enforcing constraints, say, on the input polygon, on the location of the guards, or on the portion of the polygon to be guarded) remain NP-hard.

Hardness and approximations The *vertex-guard problem* is a discrete version of the art gallery problem where the guards must be located at the vertices of the polygon. This version is also NP-hard [34, 40] with known logarithmic factor [25] and sub-logarithmic factor [30] approximation algorithms. A similar sub-logarithmic approximation is known for the case where the guards can lie anywhere on the boundary of the polygon [30]. Better approximation algorithms are known for monotone polygons [32] and weakly-visible polygons [4, 8].

Terrain guarding is a related problem in which we are given a 1.5-dimensional terrain (i.e., an x -monotone polygonal chain), and the goal is to find a minimum number of guards on the terrain

that guards the terrain—this is a variant of the boundary guarding problem. This problem is also NP-hard [13, 31], and admits polynomial time approximation scheme [4, 26].

Both versions of the problem (point-guard and vertex-guard) remain NP-hard in orthogonal polygons³ [43]. Even if we want to guard only the vertices of an orthogonal polygon, the problem is still NP-hard [29] for three versions where the guards can lie on vertices, on the boundary, or anywhere in the polygon.

Polynomial-time exact algorithms For some trivial instances, the art gallery problem can be solved in polynomial time, such as for convex, star-shaped, and spiral polygons. Finding non-trivial instances that admit polynomial-time algorithms is of particular interest. To the best of our knowledge, there are only a few non-trivial instances for which the problem can be solved optimally in polynomial time. These instances usually enforce constraints on the polygon itself or on the definition of visibility. For example, the authors in [15] present polynomial-time algorithms when the polygon is uni-monotone (i.e. one of its polygonal chains is a straight line segment)⁴ and for 1.5-dimensional terrains where all the guards must be placed on a horizontal line above the terrain.

The art gallery problem can be solved in polynomial time on orthogonal polygons but under *rectilinear* visibility [49] and *staircase* visibility [37]. In the former case, two points are visible if their minimum orthogonal bounding box lies in the polygon, and in the latter case, two points are visible if there is an x - and y -monotone path between them in the polygon.

All the above algorithms [15, 37, 49] are obtained by using the notion of *perfectness* of P , which means that the minimum number of guards is equal to the maximum number of points that can be placed in P such that their visibility polygons are pairwise disjoint.

Combinatorial bounds While most variants of the art gallery problem are hard with high computational complexities, tight combinatorial bounds are known on the number of guards that are always sufficient and sometimes necessary to guard a polygon with n vertices. For the original art gallery problem the bound is $\lfloor n/3 \rfloor$ for both point-guards and vertex-guards [14, 22], and it is $\lfloor n/4 \rfloor$ for orthogonal polygons [27, 36, 42, 48]. Tight bounds are also known for variants where an entire edge or diagonal can serve as a guard [9, 38, 44].

Contiguity The contiguous guarding is in particular related to guarding polygons with cameras/guards that have a bounded field of view (i.e. the maximum angle a camera can cover is limited) [46, 47] and to the so-called *city guarding* problems [7, 10, 16]. It is also related to contiguous guarding of points on a 1.5-dimensional terrain by placing at most k watchtowers such that each watchtower sees a contiguous sequence of points [28].

1.3 Preliminaries

Let P be a simple polygon. We denote the boundary of P by ∂P . We define a *chain* as a connected portion of ∂P . A *reflex vertex* of P is a vertex with an interior angle greater than π . A vertex of P with an interior angle less than or equal to π is called a *convex vertex*.

A *triangulation* of P is a partition of the interior of P into a set of triangles whose corners are at vertices of P . It is well-known that the dual of any triangulation of an n -vertex polygon is a binary tree with $n - 2$ nodes. The *diameter* of a tree is the number of edges of a longest path in the tree.

³Also known as rectilinear polygons.

⁴This type of polygons are also referred to as monotone mountains.

2 Combinatorial Bounds

In this section we determine the number of guards that are always sufficient and sometimes necessary to guard an n -vertex polygon.

It is easily seen that a chain with n edges can be covered by $\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor$ guards —this can be achieved by placing a guard at every second vertex. Thus it follows that a polygon with n vertices (and hence n edges) can be covered by $\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor$ guards. As we will see later, this bound is very close to the best achievable bound but is not tight. We need stronger ingredients, such as the following lemma, to obtain a tight bound.

Lemma 1. *For any polygon P with at least 8 vertices, one of the following statements holds.*

1. *There is a vertex that covers 6 consecutive edges of ∂P .*
2. *There are two vertices that cover 7 consecutive edges of ∂P .*
3. *There are two vertices that cover a total of 8 edges of ∂P such that each vertex covers 4 consecutive edges.*

Proof. Triangulate P and let T be the dual tree of the triangulation. The largest vertex-degree in T is at most 3. Since $n \geq 8$, T has at least 6 nodes, and hence its diameter is at least 3. The diameter is determined by a path, say δ , with at least 4 nodes where the two end-nodes, say p and q , are leaves. Let p' and q' be the unique neighbors of p and q in T , respectively. We consider the following three cases that are depicted in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 1.

- *Both p' and q' have degree 3.* This case is depicted in Figure 1(a). Since δ is a longest path in the tree, p' has a neighbor p'' in T , different from p , that is also a leaf. The three triangles that correspond to p, p', p'' consist of 4 consecutive edges of ∂P that are visible from their middle vertex. A similar argument holds for q' . Since the diameter is at least 3, the four edges that we get for q' are different from those for p' . The two middle vertices cover the 8 edges, and thus statement 3 holds.
- *One of p' and q' has degree 3 and the other has degree 2.* Due to symmetry assume that p' has degree 3, as in Figure 1(b). As in the previous case, we get four consecutive edges of ∂P for p' that can be covered by their middle vertex. The two triangles that correspond to q, q' consist of three consecutive edges of ∂P where one of their vertices, say v , is incident to both triangles. The vertex v covers these three edges and another edge e on the remaining portion of ∂P . If e is among the four edges of p' , then statement 2 holds; otherwise statement 3 holds.
- *Both p' and q' have degree 2.* See Figure 1(c). Define e, v , and its four covering edges as in the previous case. Let e' and v' be the analogous edge and vertex for p' . If $v = v'$, then v

covers six consecutive edges; thus, statement 1 holds. Assume that $v \neq v'$. Then, the four edges of p' and the four edges of q' can share at most one edge, which could be e or e' . If they share an edge then statement 2 holds, otherwise statement 3 holds. \square

Theorem 1. *The boundary of any polygon with $n \geq 4$ vertices can be covered contiguously by at most $\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor$ guards. This bound is tight for both even and odd n .*

Proof. Let P be a polygon with $n \geq 4$ vertices. If $n = 4, 5$, then one vertex of the polygon can cover the entire boundary (to verify this, observe that in any triangulation of a 5-gon, there is a vertex that is incident to the three resulting triangles). If $n = 6$, then there is a diagonal that partitions the boundary of P into 2 and 4 consecutive edges;⁵ each partite can be covered by one vertex. If $n = 7$, then there is a diagonal that partitions the boundary of P into 3 and 4 consecutive edges; again, each partite can be covered by one vertex.

Assume that $n \geq 8$. Then, at least one of the cases in Lemma 1 holds. For each case, we show how to cover ∂P by the number of guards that are claimed.

- *Statement 1 holds.* We cover 6 consecutive edges by 1 guard and the remaining chain of $n-6$ edges by at most $\lfloor \frac{n-5}{2} \rfloor$ guards. Thus, the total number of guards is at most $\lfloor \frac{n-3}{2} \rfloor$.
- *Statement 2 holds.* We cover 7 consecutive edges by 2 guards and the remaining chain of $n-7$ edges by at most $\lfloor \frac{n-6}{2} \rfloor$ guards. The total number of guards is at most $\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor$.
- *Statement 3 holds.* We cover the 8 edges by two guards. If 8 edges are consecutive, then we cover the remaining chain as in the previous case. Assume they are not consecutive and thus split into two sets, each having four consecutive edges. The remaining $n-8$ edges of ∂P form two disjoint chains of n_1 and n_2 edges that can be covered by at most $\lfloor \frac{n_1+1}{2} \rfloor$ and $\lfloor \frac{n_2+1}{2} \rfloor$ guards, respectively. The total number of guards is at most $\lfloor \frac{n_1+1}{2} \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{n_2+1}{2} \rfloor + 2 \leq \frac{n-2}{2}$. This equals $\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor$ when n is even. When n is odd, one of the chain sizes, say n_1 , is even, and hence the chain itself can be covered by at most $\lfloor \frac{n_1}{2} \rfloor$ guards, which would result in at most $\frac{n-3}{2} \leq \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor$ total guards.




Figure 2: Illustration of the lower bound $\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor$ guards. The polygonal arcs around the boundary are maximal chains that can each be guarded by a single guard.

To verify the lower bound, see the polygon in Figure 2 of size $n = 4k + 2$, for some integer k , which consists of two convex chains of odd length $\frac{n}{2}$. The chains are placed close to each other such that the midpoints of no three consecutive edges on a chain are visible from the same point

⁵For any $k \geq 2$ there is a diagonal that cuts off at least k and at most $2k-2$ edges of the polygon; see [9].

in the polygon. A guard cannot cover more than two consecutive midpoints on each chain. To cover each chain, we need at least $\lfloor \frac{n/2+1}{2} \rfloor$ guards, out of which only two guards that cover the two endpoints of the chain can be shared. Thus, we need at least $2\lfloor \frac{n/2+1}{2} \rfloor - 2 = \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor$ guards to cover the boundary of this polygon contiguously. This verifies the tightness of the bound for even n . By adding a vertex on any edge of the polygon in Figure 2, a lower bound example for odd n is obtained. \square

3 Preliminaries for the Algorithms

For two points p and q in the plane, we denote by pq the straight line segment between p and q . A *ray* from p toward q , denoted \overrightarrow{pq} , is the half-line that starts from p and passes through q . A *wedge* is a region of the plane that is bounded by two rays starting from the same point known as the *apex* of the wedge.

Let P be a simple polygon. Two points p and q of P are said to be *visible* (or *see* each other) if the line segment pq lies totally inside (in the interior or on the boundary of) P . The *visibility region* of P from a point $q \in P$, denoted $V(P, q)$, is the set of all points of P that are visible from q ; see Figure 3. It is well-known that $V(P, q)$ is a simple polygon and can be computed in linear time, see e.g. [21, 33, 41]. The region $V(P, q)$ is also referred to as the *visibility polygon* of q . The visibility polygon is *star-shaped*, i.e., all its points are visible from a single point called a *center*. The set of all centers of a star-shaped polygon is called *kernel*; it can be computed in linear time [35].




Figure 3: The boundary of the polygon is assumed to be directed counter-clockwise.

To simplify our notation, we write ∂ for ∂P . We assume that ∂ is a directed cycle, with vertices ordered counter-clockwise. For an ordered pair (p_1, p_2) of two points on ∂ , we denote by $\partial(p_1, p_2)$ the portion of ∂ from p_1 to p_2 in counter-clockwise direction— $\partial(p_1, p_2)$ is a directed path. Observe that ∂ is the union of $\partial(p_1, p_2)$ and $\partial(p_2, p_1)$. We refer to p_1 and p_2 as the *first* and the *last* endpoints of $\partial(p_1, p_2)$, respectively. Since $\partial(p_1, p_2)$ is directed, for any two points p and q on $\partial(p_1, p_2)$, we can tell if p appears *before* or *after* q .

Let g be a guard in some guarding of ∂ . Let $\partial(g)$ denote a connected subset of ∂ that is covered by g (refer to Figure 3). We denote by $w(g)$ the wedge with apex g and boundary rays that go through the endpoints of $\partial(g)$. We refer to the angle at the apex of $w(g)$ as the *covering angle* of g ; when it is clear from the context we use $w(g)$ to refer to this angle. Let Γ be a contiguous guarding of ∂ , which is a set of guards with a connected subset of ∂ assigned to every guard. We say that Γ is *minimal* if the removal of any guard from Γ would result in an uncovered portion of ∂ . Thus every guard g , in a minimal contiguous guarding, covers a unique point g_p of ∂ , because otherwise we could remove g from the guard set. Without further mentioning, all guard sets considered in this

paper are minimal. For any (minimal) contiguous guarding, we order the guards counter-clockwise along ∂ based on the order of g_p s. This way, the terms *previous* guard, *next* guard, and *consecutive* guards are well defined.

A *segment* of ∂ is an edge or a portion of some edge of ∂ . Let s be a segment of ∂ . We define the *covering region* of s , denoted $C(P, s)$, as the set of all points of P where each point sees the entire s . Notice that every point of s and every point of $C(P, s)$ are visible to each other.⁶ We define the covering region $C(P, \delta)$ of a polygonal path $\delta \in \partial$ analogously. If p is a point in the covering region of s (resp. δ) then we say that p *covers* s (resp. δ).

The following observation and lemmas, though very simple, play important roles in our algorithms. Observation 1 and Lemma 2 can also be implied from ideas of [23, Lemma 1 and Theorem 1]; see also the companion paper [24].

Observation 1. *A guard g covers a segment $s \in \partial$ if and only if g sees both endpoints of s .*

Proof. Let $s = ab$. For the forward direction, if g covers s , it sees all points of s , including its endpoints a and b . For the converse, if g sees both a and b , then the interior of the triangle $\triangle pab$ is in the interior of P , and thus g sees all points on the segment s . \square

From Observation 1 it follows that for a segment $s = ab$ on ∂ we have $C(P, s) = V(P, a) \cap V(P, b)$. Therefore, the covering region of a polygonal path δ on ∂ is the intersection of the visibility polygons of all vertices of δ .

Lemma 2. *Let δ be a polygonal path on ∂ . Then, $C(P, \delta)$ is a simple polygon, and it can be computed in a polynomial time.*

Proof. To prove the first statement it suffices to show that for any two points p and q in $C = C(P, \delta)$, there is a path between p and q in C . Let a and b denote the endpoints of δ . Let C_p be the star-shaped polygon bounded by δ and the rays \vec{pa} and \vec{pb} . Define C_q analogously.

If $q \in C_p$ or $p \in C_q$, then any point on the line segment pq is in C because otherwise, the visibility of some point $x \in pq$ and some point $y \in \delta$ is blocked by some edge $e \in \delta$ in which case y cannot be seen by p or by q , a contradiction. Thus, pq is a path in C .

Assume that $q \notin C_p$ and $p \notin C_q$. In this case, a boundary ray of C_p and a boundary ray of C_q intersect at a point c , which is different from a and b . We claim that c is in C , because otherwise the visibility of c and some point $y \in \delta$ is blocked by some edge $e \in \delta$, in which case y cannot be seen by p or q , a contradiction. Since $c \in C$, the previous argument implies that the segments pc and cq are in C ; these segments form a path between p and q in C .

To prove the second statement, recall that $C(P, \delta)$ is the intersection of visibility polygons of all vertices of δ . Since the visibility polygon from a point [33] and the intersection of two polygons [17] can be found in polynomial time, $C(P, \delta)$ can be computed in polynomial time by walking on δ and computing the intersection of the current covering region (which is a simple polygon by the first statement) with the visibility polygon of the next vertex on δ . \square

Lemma 3. *Let p be a fixed point on ∂ . In polynomial time, we can find the farthest point q from p in counter-clockwise (or clockwise) direction along ∂ such that $\partial(p, q)$ can be covered by one guard. Such a guard can also be found in a polynomial time.*

Proof. Due to symmetry, we explain the proof for the counter-clockwise direction. Let e be the edge of ∂ that contains p , and let p_0 be the endpoint of e after p . Denote the segment pp_0 by e_0 . Find the longest polygonal path δ consisting of a sequence e_0, e_1, \dots, e_t of consecutive edges of ∂

⁶Also known as *complete visibility* where every point of s and every point of C are visible to each other [5].

such that the covering region C of δ is nonempty. In view of Lemma 2, this path can be found in polynomial time by iteratively considering the edges after e_0 and computing the covering region in each iteration.

Let e_{t+1} be the edge of ∂ after e_t . Our choice of δ implies that the covering region of the concatenation of δ and e_{t+1} is empty. Moreover, q lies in the interior or on an endpoint of e_{t+1} . Let p_t and p_{t+1} be the endpoints of e_{t+1} where p_{t+1} appears after p_t . Observe that every point of C sees p_t , but no point of C sees p_{t+1} . The point q is then the farthest point from p_t on e_{t+1} , that is visible from a point of C . In particular, q is the intersection point of e_{t+1} and a ray from a vertex of C through a reflex vertex of P . Thus q can be found in polynomial time by checking all such rays. \square

4 A Greedy Algorithm

In this section we present a greedy algorithm, for contiguous guarding of ∂ , that finds a guard set Γ of size at most $\text{OPT}+1$.

If the intersection of the supporting halfplanes of the edges of P is nonempty, then P is star-shaped. In this case, by placing a guard at the intersection we cover ∂ , and thus $|\Gamma| = 1$.

From now on assume that P is not star-shaped. Let p_1 be an arbitrary point on ∂ , referred to as the *starting point*. Let $p_2 \in \partial$ be the farthest point from p_1 in counter-clockwise direction such that $\partial(p_1, p_2)$ can be covered by one guard. Let $p'_1 \in \partial$ be the farthest point from p_2 in clockwise direction such that $\partial(p'_1, p_2)$ can be covered by one guard. See Figure 4. Observe that $p_1 \in \partial(p'_1, p_2)$; it might be the case that $p'_1 = p_1$. Let p_3, \dots, p_m , with $m \geq 3$, be the points on ∂ such that

1. p_i is the farthest point from p_{i-1} in counter-clockwise direction such that $\partial(p_{i-1}, p_i)$ can be covered by one guard, and
2. m is the smallest index for which $p'_1 \in \partial(p_{m-1}, p_m)$.

We cover $\partial(p'_1, p_2)$ by a guard g_1 , and for each $i \in \{3, 4, \dots, m\}$ we cover $\partial(p_{i-1}, p_i)$ by a guard g_{i-1} as in Figure 4. In this case $|\Gamma| = m-1$. By Lemma 3 the points $p_2, p'_1, p_3, \dots, p_m$ and the guards g_1, \dots, g_{m-1} can be computed in polynomial time.




Figure 4: Illustration of the proof of Theorem 2. (a) p_1 is covered by one guard g_1^* in an optimal solution. (b) p_1 is covered by two guards g_1^* and g_2^* in an optimal solution.

Theorem 2. *The Greedy Algorithm, starting from an arbitrary point p_1 , runs in polynomial time and returns a guard set Γ of size at most $\text{OPT}+1$. Moreover, if p_1 is covered by two guards in some optimal solution, then $|\Gamma| = \text{OPT}$.*

Proof. By construction Γ covers the entire ∂ . Determining whether P is start-shaped can be done in polynomial time by checking the intersection of the supporting halfplanes of edges. If P is star-shaped then Γ has one guard in which case $|\Gamma| = \text{OPT}$.

Assume that P is not star-shaped, and hence $\text{OPT} \geq 2$. Having p_1 , we can find p_2 in polynomial time by Lemma 3. Having p_2 , we can find p'_1 and g_1 in polynomial time again by Lemma 3. Similarly, for each p_i , with $i \geq 2$, we can find p_{i+1} and g_{i-1} in polynomial time. Thus, the algorithm runs in polynomial time.

Now we prove our claim about the size of Γ , which is $m - 1$; the proof is a standard argument that shows the analogous statements for the circular arc cover problem. First, assume that there is no optimal solution in which p_1 is covered by two guards. This case is illustrated in Figure 4(a). Consider some optimal solution and let g_1^* be the only guard in this solution that covers p_1 . Let p_1^*, p_2^* be the first and last endpoints of $\partial(g_1^*)$, respectively. By our choice of p_2 , the point p_2^* appears on or before p_2 . By our choice of m and p_{m-1} , the point p_1^* appears on or after p_{m-2} , because otherwise p_1^* would be in $\partial(p_{m-2}, p_{m-1})$. For the next counter-clockwise guard in the optimal solution, say g_2^* , the last endpoint p_3^* of $\partial(g_2^*)$ lies on or before p_3 . Continuing this argument there must be a guard g_{m-2}^* in the optimal solution such that the last endpoint p_{m-1}^* of $\partial(g_{m-2}^*)$ appears on or before p_{m-1} . Therefore, the optimal solution has at least $m-2$ guards. Thus $|\Gamma| \leq \text{OPT} + 1$.

Now assume that p_1 is covered by two guards, say g_1^* and g_2^* , in some optimal solution, where g_1^* appears before g_2^* . We follow an argument similar to the previous case from g_2^* . By our choice of p_2 , the last endpoint p_3^* of $\partial(g_2^*)$ appears on or before p_2 . Continuing this argument, the last endpoint of p_{m-1}^* of $\partial(g_{m-2}^*)$ appears on or before p_{m-2} . On the other hand, the guards g_1^* and g_2^* cannot cover p_{m-2} , because otherwise g_{m-2} would cover p_1 and hence p'_1 , contradicting our choice of m . Thus the optimal must have another guard g_{m-1}^* to cover the gap between the coverages of g_{m-2}^* and g_1^* . Therefore $|\Gamma| = \text{OPT} = m-1$. \square

The following is a direct corollary of Theorem 2.

Corollary 1. *The contiguous boundary guarding problem can be solved in polynomial time if we know a point of the boundary that is covered by two guards in some optimal solution.*

5 An Optimal Algorithm

In this section we present a polynomial-time exact algorithm for contiguous guarding of the boundary ∂ of a simple polygon P . If P is star-shaped, then the greedy algorithm returns an optimal solution. Thus, we assume that P is not star-shaped and hence $\text{OPT} \geq 2$. We start with a simple observation.

Observation 2. *Let g be a guard in a guarding of ∂ . Then, the first endpoint of $\partial(g)$ is covered by g and by the previous guard. Similarly, the last endpoint of $\partial(g)$ is covered by g and the next guard.*

Without loss of generality, we assume the following maximality property: *any guard g covers a maximal contiguous portion of ∂ , i.e., $\partial(g)$ is maximal.* This implies the following lemma.

Lemma 4. *Let g be a maximal guard in a guarding of ∂ . Then, each boundary ray of $w(g)$ goes through at least one reflex vertex of P .*

Proof. Since P is not star-shaped, g cannot cover the entire ∂ and thus $w(g) < 2\pi$. The lemma holds because otherwise, we could increase the covering angle of g and extend $\partial(g)$, contradicting our maximality assumption. This is depicted in Figure 5. \square




Figure 5: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 4.

Algorithm (in a nutshell). Our algorithm is fairly simple. It finds a polynomial-size set S of starting points on ∂ such that at least one of the points is covered by two guards in some optimal solution. We execute the greedy algorithm for each point in S and return the smallest guard set over all the points in S . From Corollary 1, it follows that the algorithm returns an optimal solution. The algorithm takes polynomial time because S has a polynomial size, and the greedy algorithm runs in polynomial time.

It remains to compute S . This is the most crucial part of the algorithm. First, we find a polynomial-size point set Q such that at least one guard in some optimal solution lies at a point of Q . For each point $q \in Q$, we compute a set $F(q)$ of all potential first endpoints of $\partial(q)$ for a guard at q . By Lemma 4, these points are the intersections of ∂ with the rays that start from q and pass through reflex vertices of P . Thus, for every reflex vertex r that is visible from q , we add the first intersection point of the ray \vec{qr} with ∂ to $F(q)$. The set S is the union of $F(q)$ over all points $q \in Q$. The set S has a polynomial size because $|Q|$ and the number of reflex vertices are bounded by polynomials.

Let g^* be a guard in an optimal solution Γ^* that lies at a point $q \in Q$. Then the first endpoint f^* of $\partial(g^*)$ is in $F(q)$, and hence in S . By Observation 2, f^* is covered by g^* and the previous guard in Γ^* . Therefore, f^* is a point in S with our desired property of being covered by two guards in an optimal solution.




Figure 6: The point set Q . Edge-extensions are in red and vertex-extensions are in blue.

Now it remains to compute Q . For every reflex vertex r of P , extend each edge incident to r inside P until hitting ∂ at some point x ; see Figure 6. We refer to the segment rx as an *edge-extension*. Add a segment between every two reflex vertices of P that are visible to each other and extend it from both endpoints inside P until hitting ∂ at points y and z . We refer to the segment yz by *vertex-extension*. We define Q as the set containing the following points

- all vertices of P ,
- all intersection points between extensions and ∂ , and
- all intersection points between extensions themselves.

The following structural lemma (proved in Section 6) shows that Q has our desired property.

Lemma 5. *Some optimal solution has a guard at a point of Q .*

If P has n vertices, then Q has $O(n^4)$ points because it is formed by the intersection points of possibly $O(n^2)$ extensions. The set S has size $O(n^5)$. The visibility polygon from a point can be computed in linear time [33], and the intersection of two polygons can be found $O(n \log n + k)$ time where k is the size of the output [6, 12, 17]. Thus, for each starting point in S , the greedy algorithm takes $O(n^2 \log n)$ time, as it computes the intersection of n polygons where each intersection is a simple polygon by Lemma 2. Therefore, the total running time of the algorithm is $O(n^7 \log n)$. This is a conservative upper bound on the running time and surely can be improved. For example, one might adopt ideas from the $O(n)$ -time incremental algorithm for the kernel of a polygon [35] to compute the covering region of a path on ∂ and consequently achieve a better running time for the greedy algorithm. Our main goal here is a proof that the decision version of the contiguous boundary guarding problem is in the complexity class \mathbf{P} . The following theorem summarizes our result.

Theorem 3. *The problem of contiguous boundary guarding of a polygon with the minimum number of guards can be solved in polynomial time.*

Remark. One might wonder if Lemma 5 holds for every optimal solution, i.e., whether every optimal solution has a guard in Q . Also, one might wonder whether an optimal solution always exists in which two guards cover the same vertex of the polygon. If this were true, then running the greedy algorithm from all vertices of the polygon would suffice. However, none of these statements are true as shown in Figure 7 (For the second statement, one can verify that no guard can cover a red cross and a blue cross simultaneously. Therefore, any optimal solution must have a guard in the red triangle and a guard in the blue triangle. Then the contiguous coverages of such guards do not have any vertex in common.)




Figure 7: An optimal solution, with two guards, none of them is in Q . The coverages of no two guards, in any optimal solution, share a vertex of the polygon.

6 A Proof of Lemma 5

We prove this lemma by contradiction. Assume that no optimal solution has a guard at a point of Q . Let Γ^* be an optimal guard set with a maximum lexicographic order of the covering angles of the guards. We refer to the boundary rays of a wedge $w(g)$ simply by the *rays* of $w(g)$. We say that a ray is *bounded* by a reflex vertex if the ray passes through a reflex vertex. By Lemma 4, for each $g \in \Gamma^*$, each ray of $w(g)$ is bounded by some reflex vertex.

Lemma 6. *Any guard $g \in \Gamma^*$ that is in the interior of P lies on exactly one edge-extension. Moreover, the corresponding edge belongs to $\partial(g)$.*

Proof. First, observe that g cannot be on two edge-extensions because otherwise g is in Q , a contradiction. If g is not on any edge-extension in $\partial(g)$ as in Figure 8, then by moving g along the bisector of $w(g)$ one can increase $w(g)$ without decreasing its coverage $\partial(g)$, a contradiction to our choice of Γ^* —this movement is possible as g is in the interior of P . Thus g lies on the extension of exactly one edge, say e . If $e \notin \partial(g)$ then we can get a similar contradiction by slightly moving g towards the bisector of $w(g)$. \square




Figure 8: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 6.

Lemma 7. *No guard $g \in \Gamma^*$ lies on a vertex-extension.*

Proof. If $g \in \partial$, then g cannot be on a vertex-extension because otherwise, it would be in Q , a contradiction. If $g \notin \partial$, then g is in the interior of P . In this case, g is on an edge-extension, by Lemma 6, and thus it cannot be on a vertex-extension as otherwise it would be in Q . \square

A guard $g \in \Gamma^*$ cannot lie on both ∂ and an edge-extension because otherwise it would be in Q , a contradiction. Moreover, a guard cannot be on a vertex of the polygon. This and Lemma 6 imply that every guard g lies either on exactly one edge of ∂ or on exactly one edge-extension but not both. For both cases, we denote the corresponding edge by $e(g)$.

Let r be a reflex vertex that bounds a ray of $w(g)$; such a reflex vertex exists by Lemma 4. We say that r bounds the ray from *outside* if both edges incident to r lie outside $w(g)$; otherwise (at least one edge lies inside $w(g)$), we say that r bounds the ray from *inside*.

Lemma 8. *For any guard $g \in \Gamma^*$, each ray of $w(g)$ is bounded by exactly one reflex vertex of P . Such a vertex bounds the ray from outside.*

Proof. This first statement is a direct implication of Lemma 4 and Lemma 7.

We prove the second statement by contradiction. Assume that a reflex vertex r bounds a ray A of $w(g)$ from inside. Then r is an endpoint of $\partial(g)$. Let B denote the other ray of $w(g)$, which is bounded from inside or outside as in Figure 9. We consider two cases:




Figure 9: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 8.

- $g \notin \partial$. Then by Lemma 6, g lies on the extension of $e(g)$, and moreover $e(g)$ belongs to $\partial(g)$. Let C and D be the rays from g towards and away from $e(g)$, respectively, as in Figure 9(a). Let α be the angle between B and C that lies inside $w(g)$. If α is at most π , then by moving g on C either g lies on a vertex-extension, or on another edge-extension, or it reaches an endpoint of $e(g)$. This movement does not decrease $\partial(g)$ because the endpoint r remains visible from g as there is no reflex vertex in the interior of A , and its endpoint on B also remains visible as the movement angle α is at most π . In all cases we get a new optimal solution that contradicts the fact that g is not in Q . Assume that $\alpha > \pi$ (this could happen for example if in Figure 9(a) the edge $e(g)$ and consequently the rays C and D were reflected around g). By moving g on D , either g lies on a vertex-extension, or on another edge-extension, or it reaches ∂ . In all cases, we get an optimal solution for which g is in Q , which is a contradiction.
- $g \in \partial$. If $w(g) \leq \pi$ then by moving g along the bisector of $w(g)$ we can increase the covering angle of g without decreasing $\partial(g)$, a contradiction to our choice of Γ^* . Assume that $w(g) > \pi$. Let C be the ray from g along $e(g)$ such that the angle between B and C inside $w(g)$ is at most π as in Figure 9(b). By moving g on $e(g)$ along C , either g lies on a vertex-extension, or on another edge-extension, or it reaches an endpoint of $e(g)$. As in the previous case, this movement does not decrease $\partial(g)$. In all cases, we get an optimal solution for which g is in Q , a contradiction. \square

Lemma 9. *For every guard $g \in \Gamma^*$, it holds that $w(g) \geq \pi$.*

Proof. First, assume that $g \notin e(g)$, and hence, it lies in the interior of P . By Lemma 8, each ray of $w(g)$ is bounded by exactly one reflex vertex from outside. If $w(g) < \pi$ then by moving g inside $w(g)$, along the extension of $e(g)$, we can increase $w(g)$ without decreasing $\partial(g)$ as in Figure 10(a). This contradicts our choice of Γ^* .

Now assume that $g \in e(g)$. If $w(g) < \pi$ then by moving g along the bisector of $w(g)$ we increase its covering angle without decreasing $\partial(g)$, a contradiction to our choice of Γ^* . \square

Let $\alpha(g)$ be the wedge with apex g that is obtained by extending boundary rays of $w(g)$ as in Figure 10(b). Since $w(g) \geq \pi$, the wedge $\alpha(g)$ lies inside $w(g)$. Moreover, $\alpha(g) \leq \pi$.

Lemma 10. *For any guard $g \in \Gamma^*$, the edge $e(g)$ is inside $w(g)$ but outside $\alpha(g)$.*

Proof. If $g \in e(g)$, then the statement holds because both rays of $w(g)$ are on the same side of $e(g)$. Assume that $g \notin e(g)$. It follows from Lemma 6 that $e(g) \in w(g)$. To verify that $e(g) \notin \alpha(g)$ observe that otherwise, we could move g along the extension of $e(g)$ inside $\alpha(g)$ to increase $w(g)$ without decreasing $\partial(g)$, a contradiction to our choice of Γ^* . \square




Figure 10: Illustration of (a) the proof of Lemma 9, and (b) statement of Lemma 10.

Let g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m be the guards in Γ^* in this order along ∂ (recall that this is the order of the unique points they cover). We modify Γ^* and obtain an optimal solution Γ such that:

- for every $g_i \in \Gamma$ it holds that $w(g_i) \geq \pi$ and $e(g_i) \in w(g_i) \setminus \alpha(g_i)$, and
- for each pair of consecutive guards g_i and g_{i+1} the intersection of $\partial(g_i)$ and $\partial(g_{i+1})$ is exactly one point, except possibly for the pair (p_m, p_1) .




Figure 11: Illustration of the movement of g along the extension of $e(g)$ or on $e(g)$.

By Lemma 10 for every $g_i \in \Gamma^*$ we have $e(g_i) \in w(g_i) \setminus \alpha(g_i)$. Assume that $g \notin e(g_i)$. Consider moving g_i along the extension of $e(g_i)$; see Figure 11(a). If we move g_i towards $e(g_i)$ then one endpoint of $\partial(g_i)$ gets shorter, and if we move g_i away from $e(g_i)$ the other endpoint of $\partial(g_i)$ gets shorter. This means that we can move g_i along the extension to make either one of $\partial(g_i) \cap \partial(g_{i+1})$ and $\partial(g_i) \cap \partial(g_{i-1})$ a point. Along this movement, g_i cannot reach $e(g_i)$ or the boundary of P because otherwise, g_i would be in Q , a contradiction. Also, g_i cannot lie on a new edge-extension or vertex-extension as it would be in Q again; in particular, this means that the boundary rays of $w(g_i)$ cannot hit a new reflex vertex.

When $g \in e(g_i)$ we can make either one of $\partial(g_i) \cap \partial(g_{i+1})$ and $\partial(g_i) \cap \partial(g_{i-1})$ a point by moving g_i on $e(g_i)$ towards an endpoint as in Figure 11(b). Again, along this movement, g_i cannot reach an endpoint or lie on a vertex-extension or on an edge-extension.

After the movement, the angle at $w(g_i)$ remains at least π because both bounding reflex vertices remain on the same side of the extension of $e(g_i)$. This also implies that $e(g_i)$ remains inside $w(g_i)$ and outside $\alpha(g_i)$.

We obtain Γ as follows. We fix g_1 and move g_2 to make $\partial(g_1) \cap \partial(g_2)$ a point. Then fix g_2 and move g_3 to make $\partial(g_2) \cap \partial(g_3)$ a point. Then we perform this for all guards g_3, g_4, \dots, g_{m-1} in this order. After this process all intersections $\partial(g_i) \cap \partial(g_{i+1})$ are points, except possibly for $\partial(g_m) \cap \partial(g_1)$. The resulting guard set is Γ .

For the rest of the proof, we consider two cases where $\text{OPT} = 2$ and $\text{OPT} \geq 3$ separately and get a contradiction in each case.




Figure 12: Illustration of the proof for the case $\text{OPT} = 2$.

Case 1 ($\text{OPT} = 2$) In this case $\partial(g_1)$ and $\partial(g_2)$ intersect at their both endpoints. One of the intersections is a point x_1 on some edge e_1 , and the other is a portion x_2 of ∂ ; see Figure 12. Let l be the line through g_1x_1 , and let r_1 be the reflex vertex on g_1x_1 . After a suitable rotation, assume that l is horizontal and r_1 bounds $w(g_1)$ from above. Consider a point x'_1 on $e \setminus \partial(g_1)$ close to x_1 — x'_1 is outside $w(g_1)$. Consider an analogous point x'_2 on $\partial \setminus \partial(g_1)$ close to x_2 — x'_2 is outside $w(g_1)$. Both x'_1 and x'_2 are covered by g_2 . Thus g_2 lies in $\alpha(g)$ as otherwise it would not cover x'_1 or x'_2 . One ray of $w(g_2)$ intersects ∂ at x_1 , and since $w(g_2) \geq \pi$ (by Lemma 9) its other ray intersects ∂ below l . Let w_1 and w_2 be the two opposite wedges of $w(g_1) \setminus \alpha(g_1)$ where w_1 contains x_1 . We have the following three cases depending on the position of g_1 and $e(g_1)$.

- $g_1 \notin e(g_1)$ and $e(g_1) \in w_1$. This case is depicted in Figure 12. By moving g_1 in w_1 towards $e(g_1)$, either g_1 lies on vertex-extension, or on a new edge-extension, or it reaches $e(g_1)$. In all cases we get a new optimal solution for which $g_1 \in Q$, a contradiction. The movement cannot make the intersection x_2 empty because the intersection point of l and ∂ remains in the coverage of g_1 (unless g_1 lies on a vertex-extension or a new edge extension during the movement). Therefore ∂ remains covered by g_1 and g_2 after the above movement, and thus the contradiction is valid.
- $g_1 \notin e(g_1)$ and $e(g_1) \in w_2$. Again, by moving g_1 in w_1 away from $e(g_1)$, either g_1 lies on vertex-extension, or on a new edge-extension, or it reaches ∂ . In all cases we get a new optimal solution for which $g_1 \in Q$, a contradiction.
- $g_1 \in e(g_1)$. By moving g_1 in w_1 on $e(g_1)$, either g_1 lies on vertex-extension or on a new edge-extension, or it reaches an endpoint of $e(g_1)$. Again, we get an optimal solution with $g_1 \in Q$, a contradiction.

Case 2 ($\text{OPT} \geq 3$) For each $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ let x_i be the point shared by $\partial(g_i)$ and $\partial(g_{i+1})$, e_i be the edge of P that contains x_i , and r_i be the reflex vertex on g_ix_i that bounds $w(g_i)$. See Figure 13. Let K_i be the portion of the polygon outside the coverage of g_i that is cut off by r_ix_i . Let y_i be the first point of ∂ hit by the ray $\overrightarrow{x_iy_i}$. It is implied from Lemma 9 that $y_i \in \partial(g_i)$. The segment x_iy_i partitions the polygon into three parts, one of which is K_i . Denote the part that lies completely in $w(g_i)$ by A_i and the third part by B_i .




Figure 13: Illustration of the proof for the case $\text{OPT} \geq 3$.

Let x'_i be a point on $e_i \cap K_i$ very close to x_i . The point x'_i is not covered by g_i but by g_{i+1} . The guard g_{i+1} cannot be in B_i because otherwise it cannot cover x'_i . It cannot be in A_i either because otherwise g_i and g_{i+1} cover the entire polygon (recall that $w(g_{i+1}) \geq \pi$), contradicting that optimal has size at least 3. Therefore g_{i+1} is in K_i , and in particular g_m is in K_{m-1} . The coverage $\partial(g_{i+1})$ of g_{i+1} also lies in K_i because its first endpoint is x_i and its last endpoint cannot go beyond r_i . This implies that K_{i+1} is a subset of K_i . Therefore K_{m-1} is in K_1 , and hence g_m lies in K_1 .

Let z_1 be the endpoint of $\partial(g_1)$ different from x_1 . Notice that $z_1 \in B_1$. Let z'_1 be a point in B_1 and on $\partial \setminus \partial(g_1)$ very close to z_1 . This point must be covered by g_m . However, this is impossible as g_m is in K_1 and its coverage is blocked by r_1 , a contradiction that the entire ∂ is covered by Γ .

7 Conclusions

We presented a polynomial-time exact algorithm as well as tight combinatorial bounds for the contiguous boundary guarding problem. One natural question is to improve the running time, say, by reducing the size of the set Q , or the size of the starting point set S , or the time of the greedy algorithm by adapting ideas from computing the kernel of a polygon [35].

Since polygon-guarding problems are typically NP-hard, it would be interesting to identify other instances that can be solved in polynomial time.

References

- [1] Mikkel Abrahamsen, Anna Adamaszek, and Tillmann Miltzow. The art gallery problem is $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete. *J. ACM*, 69(1):4:1–4:70, 2022. Also in STOC’18. doi:10.1145/3486220.
- [2] Alok Aggarwal. *The art gallery theorem: its variations, applications and algorithmic aspects*. PhD thesis, The Johns Hopkins University, 1984.
- [3] Reymond Akpanya, Bastien Rivier, and Frederick B. Stock. Open problems from CCCG 2024. In *Proceedings of the 36th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry (CCCG)*, pages 167–170, 2024.
- [4] Stav Ashur, Omrit Filtser, Matthew J Katz, and Rachel Saban. Terrain-like graphs: PTASs for guarding weakly-visible polygons and terrains. *Computational Geometry*, 101:101832, 2022. doi:10.1016/J.COMGEO.2021.101832.

- [5] David Avis and Godfried T. Toussaint. An optimal algorithm for determining the visibility of a polygon from an edge. *IEEE Trans. Computers*, 30(12):910–914, 1981. doi:10.1109/TC.1981.1675729.
- [6] Ivan J. Balaban. An optimal algorithm for finding segments intersections. In *Proceedings of the 11th Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry (SCG)*, pages 211–219. ACM, 1995. doi:10.1145/220279.220302.
- [7] Lichen Bao, Sergey Bereg, Ovidiu Daescu, Simeon C. Ntafos, and Junqiang Zhou. On some city guarding problems. In *Proceedings of the 14th Annual International Conference on Computing and Combinatorics (COCOON)*, volume 5092 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 600–610. Springer, 2008.
- [8] Pritam Bhattacharya, Subir Kumar Ghosh, and Bodhayan Roy. Approximability of guarding weak visibility polygons. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 228:109–129, 2017. doi:10.1016/J.DAM.2016.12.015.
- [9] Ahmad Biniiaz. Art galleries and mobile guards: Revisiting O’rourke’s proof. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA)*, volume 308 of *LIPICs*, pages 27:1–27:4, 2024. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ESA.2024.27.
- [10] Ahmad Biniiaz and Mohammad Hashemi. City guarding with cameras of bounded field of view. In *Proceedings of the 35th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry (CCCG)*, pages 71–76, 2023.
- [11] Édouard Bonnet and Tillmann Miltzow. An approximation algorithm for the art gallery problem. In *33rd International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG)*, volume 77 of *LIPICs*, pages 20:1–20:15, 2017. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.SOCG.2017.20.
- [12] Bernard Chazelle and Herbert Edelsbrunner. An optimal algorithm for intersecting line segments in the plane. *J. ACM*, 39(1):1–54, 1992. Also in FOCS’88. doi:10.1145/147508.147511.
- [13] Danny Z. Chen, Vladimir Estivill-Castro, and Jorge Urrutia. Optimal guarding of polygons and monotone chains. In *Proceedings of the 7th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry, (CCCG)*, pages 133–138, 1995.
- [14] Vasek Chvátal. A combinatorial theorem in plane geometry. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 18(1):39–41, 1975.
- [15] Ovidiu Daescu, Stephan Friedrichs, Hemant Malik, Valentin Polishchuk, and Christiane Schmidt. Altitude terrain guarding and guarding uni-monotone polygons. *Computational Geometry*, 84:22–35, 2019. doi:10.1016/J.COMGEO.2019.07.004.
- [16] Ovidiu Daescu and Hemant Malik. New bounds on guarding problems for orthogonal polygons in the plane using vertex guards with halfplane vision. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 882:63–76, 2021. doi:10.1016/J.TCS.2021.06.012.
- [17] Mark de Berg, Otfried Cheong, Marc J. van Kreveld, and Mark H. Overmars. *Computational geometry: algorithms and applications, 3rd Edition*. Springer, 2008.

- [18] Ajay Deshpande, Taejung Kim, Erik D. Demaine, and Sanjay E. Sarma. A pseudopolynomial time $O(\log n)$ -approximation algorithm for art gallery problems. In Frank K. H. A. Dehne, Jörg-Rüdiger Sack, and Norbert Zeh, editors, *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures (WADS)*, volume 4619, pages 163–174, 2007. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-73951-7_15.
- [19] Alon Efrat and Sarel Har-Peled. Guarding galleries and terrains. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 100(6):238–245, 2006. doi:10.1016/J.IPL.2006.05.014.
- [20] Stephan J. Eidenbenz, Christoph Stamm, and Peter Widmayer. Inapproximability results for guarding polygons and terrains. *Algorithmica*, 31(1):79–113, 2001. doi:10.1007/S00453-001-0040-8.
- [21] Hossam A. ElGindy and David Avis. A linear algorithm for computing the visibility polygon from a point. *J. Algorithms*, 2(2):186–197, 1981. doi:10.1016/0196-6774(81)90019-5.
- [22] Steve Fisk. A short proof of chvátal’s watchman theorem. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 24(3):374, 1978. doi:10.1016/0095-8956(78)90059-X.
- [23] Subir Kumar Ghosh. Computing the visibility polygon from a convex set and related problems. *J. Algorithms*, 12(1):75–95, 1991. doi:10.1016/0196-6774(91)90024-S.
- [24] Subir Kumar Ghosh. Corrigendum: A note on computing the visibility polygon from a convex chain. *J. Algorithms*, 21(3):657–662, 1996. doi:10.1006/JAGM.1996.0064.
- [25] Subir Kumar Ghosh. Approximation algorithms for art gallery problems in polygons. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 158(6):718–722, 2010. Also in Canad. Information Processing Soc. Congress 1987. doi:10.1016/J.DAM.2009.12.004.
- [26] Matt Gibson, Gaurav Kanade, Erik A. Krohn, and Kasturi R. Varadarajan. Guarding terrains via local search. *J. Comput. Geom.*, 5(1):168–178, 2014. doi:10.20382/JOCG.V5I1A9.
- [27] Jeff Kahn, Maria Klawe, and Daniel Kleitman. Traditional galleries require fewer watchmen. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 4(2):194–206, 1983.
- [28] Byeonguk Kang, Junhyeok Choi, Jeusun Han, and Hee-Kap Ahn. Guarding points on a terrain by watchtowers. In *Proceedings of the 36th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry*, pages 41–47, 2024.
- [29] Matthew J. Katz and Gabriel S. Roisman. On guarding the vertices of rectilinear domains. *Comput. Geom.*, 39(3):219–228, 2008. doi:10.1016/J.COMGEO.2007.02.002.
- [30] James King and David G. Kirkpatrick. Improved approximation for guarding simple galleries from the perimeter. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 46(2):252–269, 2011. doi:10.1007/S00454-011-9352-X.
- [31] James King and Erik Krohn. Terrain guarding is NP-hard. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 40(5):1316–1339, 2011. Also in SODA’10. doi:10.1137/100791506.
- [32] Erik A. Krohn and Bengt J Nilsson. Approximate guarding of monotone and rectilinear polygons. *Algorithmica*, 66:564–594, 2013. doi:10.1007/S00453-012-9653-3.
- [33] D. T. Lee. Visibility of a simple polygon. *Comput. Vis. Graph. Image Process.*, 22(2):207–221, 1983. doi:10.1016/0734-189X(83)90065-8.

- [34] D. T. Lee and Arthur K. Lin. Computational complexity of art gallery problems. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 32(2):276–282, 1986. doi:10.1109/TIT.1986.1057165.
- [35] D. T. Lee and Franco P. Preparata. An optimal algorithm for finding the kernel of a polygon. *J. ACM*, 26(3):415–421, 1979. doi:10.1145/322139.322142.
- [36] Anna Lubiw. Decomposing polygonal regions into convex quadrilaterals. In *Proceedings of the first annual symposium on Computational geometry*, pages 97–106, 1985. doi:10.1145/323233.323247.
- [37] Rajeev Motwani, Arvind Raghunathan, and Huzur Saran. Covering orthogonal polygons with star polygons: The perfect graph approach. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 40(1):19–48, 1990. Also in SCG’88. doi:10.1016/0022-0000(90)90017-F.
- [38] Joseph O’Rourke. Galleries need fewer mobile guards: A variation on Chvátal’s theorem. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 14:273–283, 1983.
- [39] Joseph O’Rourke. *Art Gallery Theorems and Algorithms*. Oxford University Press, 1987.
- [40] Joseph O’Rourke and Kenneth Supowit. Some NP-hard polygon decomposition problems. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 29(2):181–190, 1983. doi:10.1109/TIT.1983.1056648.
- [41] Franco P. Preparata and Michael Ian Shamos. *Computational Geometry - An Introduction*. Texts and Monographs in Computer Science. Springer, 1985. doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-1098-6.
- [42] Jörg-Rüdiger Sack and Godfried T. Toussaint. Guard placement in rectilinear polygons. In *Machine Intelligence and Pattern Recognition*, volume 6, pages 153–175. Elsevier, 1988.
- [43] Dietmar Schuchardt and Hans-Dietrich Hecker. Two NP-hard art-gallery problems for ortho-polygons. *Math. Log. Q.*, 41:261–267, 1995. doi:10.1002/MALQ.19950410212.
- [44] Thomas C Shermer. Recent results in art galleries (geometry). *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 80(9):1384–1399, 1992. doi:10.1109/5.163407.
- [45] Jack Stade. The point-boundary art gallery problem is $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -hard. *arXiv:2210.12817*, 2023.
- [46] Csaba D Tóth. Art gallery problem with guards whose range of vision is 180. *Computational Geometry*, 17(3-4):121–134, 2000. doi:10.1016/S0925-7721(00)00023-7.
- [47] Csaba D Tóth. Art galleries with guards of uniform range of vision. *Computational Geometry*, 21(3):185–192, 2002. doi:10.1016/S0925-7721(01)00024-4.
- [48] Jorge Urrutia. Art gallery and illumination problems. In *Handbook of computational geometry*, pages 973–1027. Elsevier, 2000.
- [49] Chris Worman and J Mark Keil. Polygon decomposition and the orthogonal art gallery problem. *International Journal of Computational Geometry & Applications*, 17(02):105–138, 2007. doi:10.1142/S0218195907002264.