

# Convex Hull and Linear Programming in Read-only Setup with Limited Work-space

Minati De<sup>1</sup>, Subhas C. Nandy<sup>1</sup>, and Sasanka Roy<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata - 700108, India

<sup>2</sup> Chennai Mathematical Institute, Chennai - 603103, India

**Abstract.** *Prune-and-search* is an important paradigm for solving many important geometric problems. We show that the general *prune-and-search* technique can be implemented where the objects are given in read-only memory. As examples we consider convex-hull in 2D, and linear programming in 2D and 3D. For the convex-hull problem, designing sub-quadratic algorithm in a read-only setup with sub-linear space is an open problem for a long time. We first propose a simple algorithm for this problem that runs in  $O(n^{\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon})$  time and  $O(n^{\frac{1}{2}})$  space. Next, we consider a restricted version of the problem where the points in  $P$  are given in sorted order with respect to their  $x$ -coordinates in a read-only array. For the linear programming problems, the constraints are given in the read-only array. The last three algorithms use *prune-and-search*, and their time and extra work-space complexities are  $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$  and  $O(\log n)$  respectively, where  $\epsilon$  is a small constant satisfying  $\sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}} < \epsilon < 1$ .

## 1 Introduction

Designing algorithmic tools with fast and limited size memory (e.g caches) but having capability of very fast processing of a massive high quality data is a challenging field of research [1, 3, 4]. The problem becomes much more difficult if the input data is given in a read-only array, and very small amount of work-space is available in the system. Such a situation arises in the concurrent programming environment where many processes access the same data, and hence modifying the data by a process during the execution is not permissible [2]. In this paper, we show that the general *prune-and-search* technique can be implemented where the objects are given in read-only array. As examples we consider convex-hull in 2D, and linear programming in 2D and 3D.

Given a set  $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$  of points in 2D, the problem of designing sub-quadratic time algorithm for computing convex hull for  $P$  with sub-linear extra work-space is an important problem and is being studied for a long time. Bronniman et al. [5] showed that Graham's scan algorithm for computing convex hull of a planar point set of size  $n$  can be made in-place maintaining  $O(n \log n)$  time complexity. Here, the extra workspace required is  $O(1)$ , and the output is

available in the same input array. In the same paper they also showed that (i) the convex hull of a point set in 2D can be computed in an in-place manner in  $O(n \log h)$  time and with  $O(1)$  extra workspace where  $h$  is the number of hull vertices, and (ii) the linear programming in 2D with  $n$  constraints can be solved in  $O(n)$  time. Very recently, Vahrenhold [11] showed that the prune-and-search algorithm by Kirkpatrick and Seidel [8] for computing the convex hull of a planar point set can also be made in-place maintaining the  $O(n \log h)$  time complexity and using only  $O(1)$  work-space. All these algorithms permute the input array after the execution. If a planar point set  $P$  is given in a read-only array, then the well-known Jarvis March algorithm computes the convex hull in  $O(nh)$  time with  $O(1)$  extra space. The problem of designing a sub-quadratic algorithm for computing convex hull in a read-only environment with sub-linear work-space is an open problem for a long time. Chan and Chen [6] proposed an algorithm that can compute the convex hull in  $O(n(\log n + \frac{n}{s}))$  time using  $O(s)$  space where  $s \leq n$  is a chosen integer. In the same paper, they proposed an  $O(n)$  time randomized algorithm for the linear programming problem in fixed dimension using  $O(\log n)$  extra space in a read-only environment. They also considered the problem of computing the convex hull where the points are sorted by their  $x$ -coordinates. The proposed algorithm is a randomized one and runs in  $O(\frac{1}{\delta}n)$  expected time and  $O(\frac{1}{\delta}n^\delta)$  extra space for any fixed  $\delta > 0$ . The algorithm can be made deterministic if the running time is increased to  $O(2^{O(\frac{1}{\delta})}n)$ . The convex hull of a simple polygon with  $n$  vertices can be computed in a read-only setup in  $O(\frac{n \log n}{\log p})$  time with  $O(\frac{p \log n}{\log p})$  extra workspace [2].

In this paper, we first address the open problem related to the convex hull problem in 2D. We show that if the points in  $P$  are given in a read-only array then the convex hull can be computed in  $O(n^{\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon})$  time and  $O(n^{\frac{1}{2}})$  extra space. Next, we consider a restricted version of the convex hull problem, where the input points are given in sorted order of their  $x$ -coordinates. Here, we can apply *prune-and-search* technique to compute the convex hull of  $P$  in  $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$  time and  $O(\log n)$  space, where  $\epsilon$  is a constant satisfying  $\sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}} < \epsilon < 1$ . We also show that similar technique works for solving the linear programming problem in 2D and 3D in the read-only setup with the same time complexity. In this context, it needs to be mentioned that a similar technique is adopted to solve the minimum enclosing circle problem for a set of points in 2D, where the input points are given in a read-only array [7].

## 2 Convex hull

### 2.1 Unrestricted version

Given a set  $P$  of  $n$  points in 2D in a read-only array, the objective is to report the vertices of the convex hull of  $P$ . We describe the method of reporting the upper-hull; the lower-hull can be computed in a similar manner. We use three arrays,

namely  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$ , each of size  $O(\sqrt{n})$  as the work-space. For the notational simplicity, we will use  $P_{(i)}$  and  $P_i$  to denote the set of points whose  $x$ -coordinate lies between  $x_{(i\sqrt{n}+1)}$  to  $x_{((i+1)\sqrt{n})}$ , and the set of points whose  $x$ -coordinate is less than  $x_{((i+1)\sqrt{n})}$  respectively, where  $x_{(k)}$  denotes the  $k$ -th smallest element among the  $x$ -coordinates of the points in  $P$ . The upper hull of  $P_{(i)}$  and  $P_i$  are denoted by  $CH_{(i)}$  and  $CH_i$  respectively. Our algorithm executes in two passes. Each pass consists of  $\lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil$  stages. In the  $i$ -th stage of the first pass, we pick up the points in  $P_{(i)}$  in the array  $A$ . We assume that  $(i-1)$  stages are complete; the vertices of  $CH_{(i-1)}$  in the convex hull  $CH_{i-1}$  are stored in the array  $B$ . The  $j$ -th element of the array  $C$  (denoted by  $C[j]$ ) contains the first and last hull-vertices  $(f_j, \ell_j)$  among the points in  $P_{(j)}$  in the convex hull  $CH_{i-1}$ ,  $j \leq i-1$ . If no such hull-vertex exists then  $C[j]$  contains  $(-1, -1)$ . We execute the following steps in the  $i$ -th stage.

1. Compute  $x_{(i\sqrt{n}+1)}$  and  $x_{((i+1)\sqrt{n})}$  among the points in the array  $P$ , and identify all the points in  $P_{(i)}$  to store them in the array  $A$ .
2. Compute the upper hull  $CH_{(i)}$  of the points in  $A$  using the in-place convex hull algorithm of [5].
3. Merge  $CH_{(i)}$  with  $CH_{i-1}$  as follows: (i) draw the common tangent  $L = [a, b]$  of  $CH_{(i-1)}$  (stored in  $B$ ) and  $CH_{(i)}$ , where  $a \in CH_{(i-1)}$  and  $b \in CH_{(i)}$ . If  $a$  is not the first vertex of  $CH_{(i-1)}$ , then update  $C[i-1]$  by  $(f_{i-1}, a)$  and put  $[b, \ell_i]$  in  $C[i]$  ( $\ell_i$  is obtained from  $A$ ). Otherwise (i.e., if  $a$  is the first vertex of  $CH_{(i-1)}$ ) then traverse the array  $C$  to identify a hull-vertex  $u \in CH_{(j)}$  of a preceding block  $j$  ( $j < i-1$ ) that is connected with  $a \in CH_{(i-1)}$ . Note that, if  $j \leq i-2$ , then all the array elements  $C[k]$ ,  $j+1 \leq k \leq i-1$  will contain  $(-1, -1)$ . We recompute  $CH_{(j)}$  and draw the common tangent of  $CH_{(i)}$  and  $CH_{(j)}$ . The same is followed until we get a tangent of  $CH_{(i)}$  and  $CH_{(j')}$  ( $j' < i-1$ ) that does not touch the vertex  $f_{j'}$ . We update  $C[j']$  and set  $C[i]$  with appropriate vertex pair.

In the second pass, we compute  $CH_{(i)}$  for all the blocks whose  $C[i] \neq (-1, -1)$ , and report only the portion from  $f_i$  to  $\ell_i$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Given a set  $P$  of  $n$  points in 2D in a read-only array, the convex-hull of  $P$  can be correctly computed in  $O(n^{\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon})$  time using  $O(n^{\frac{1}{2}})$  extra-space, where  $\sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}} < \epsilon < 1$ .*

*Proof.* The correctness follows from the fact that in the  $i$ -th stage,  $CH_{(i)}$  is appropriately merged with  $CH_{i-1}$ . We now analyze the time complexity of the first pass. In each stage  $i$ ,  $x_{(i\sqrt{n}+1)}$  to  $x_{((i+1)\sqrt{n})}$  can be computed in  $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$  time using  $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$  extra space, where  $\sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}} < \epsilon < 1$  (see the algorithm of [10] in Appendix 1). Next, the convex hull  $CH_{(i)}$  in the array  $A$  is computed in  $O(\sqrt{n} \log n)$  time [5]. While merging  $CH_{(i)}$  with  $CH_{i-1}$ , we may need to recompute  $CH_{(j)}$  for different  $j < i-1$ . However, the recomputation of the convex hull

of a block implies that there exists a block whose no vertex participate in the convex hull of  $P$ . Thus the amortized complexity of pass 1 is  $O(n^{\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon} + n \log n)$ . The second pass needs the same amount of time. The space complexity follows from the size of  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$ , and the fact that  $\frac{\log n}{\log \log n} < n$ .  $\square$

## 2.2 Restricted version

Given a set  $P$  of  $n$  points in 2D sorted with respect to their  $x$ -coordinates in a read-only array, the objective is to report the edges of the convex hull of the points in  $P$ . We will show how Kirkpatrick and Seidel's [8] deterministic prune-and-search algorithm for computing convex hull can be implemented in this framework.

The algorithm in [8] computes upper-hull and lower-hull separately and report them. The basic steps of computing upper-hull for a set of points  $P$  is given in Algorithm 1. Lower-hull can be computed in a similar way. Algorithm 1 follows divide-and-conquer paradigm. It uses a procedure COMPUTE-BRIDGE to compute the bridge between two disjoint subsets of  $P$  using the prune-and-search technique. The details of this procedure is described in Algorithm 2.

---

### Algorithm 1: KS-UPPER-HULL( $P$ )

---

**Input:** A set of points  $P$  in 2D sorted according to  $x$ -coordinates

**Output:** The upper-hull of  $P$

\*(Uses divide-and-conquer technique)\*

**STEP 1:** Find the point  $p_m \in P$  having median  $x$ -coordinate;

**STEP 2:** Partition  $P$  into two subset  $P_\ell$  and  $P_r$  where  $P_\ell$  contains all the points in  $P$  whose  $x$ -coordinate is less than or equal to  $x(p_m)$  and  $P_r = P \setminus P_\ell$ ;

**STEP 3:**  $(a, b) = \text{COMPUTE-BRIDGE}(P_\ell, P_r)$ ; (\* This procedure computes the bridge between  $P_\ell$  and  $P_r$ ;  $a \in P_\ell$ ,  $b \in P_r$  \*)

**STEP 4:** Report  $(a, b)$ ;

**STEP 5:** Compute  $P_\ell = P_\ell \setminus P'_\ell$ , where  $P'_\ell = \{p \in P_\ell | x(p) > x(a)\}$ , and  $P_r = P_r \setminus P'_r$ , where  $P'_r = \{p \in P_r | x(p) < x(b)\}$ ;

**STEP 6:** KS-UPPER-HULL( $P_\ell$ );

**STEP 7:** KS-UPPER-HULL( $P_r$ );

---

The straight-forward implementation of the algorithm KS-UPPER-HULL in a read-only memory requires  $O(n)$  space for the procedure COMPUTE-BRIDGE as it needs to remember which points were pruned in the previous iterations. In addition, the algorithm KS-UPPER-HULL( $P$ ) reports the hull-edges in an arbitrary fashion (not in order along the boundary of the convex hull) and takes  $O(\log n)$  space for the recursions. So, the main hurdle in read-only model is to (i) report the hull edges in order, and (ii) implement the procedure COMPUTE-BRIDGE using only  $O(\log n)$  extra-space. In the next subsections, we describe how to resolve these issues. With this we have following main result:

---

**Algorithm 2:** COMPUTE-BRIDGE( $P_\ell, P_r$ )

---

**Input:** Two sets of points in 2D,  $P_\ell$  and  $P_r$  sorted according to  $x$ -coordinates

**Output:** The bridge between  $P_\ell$  and  $P_r$

\*(Uses prune-and-search technique)\*

**STEP 1:**

**while**  $|P_\ell| > 1$  *and*  $|P_r| > 1$  **do**

**STEP 1.1:** Arbitrarily pair-up points in  $P_\ell \cup P_r$ ; Let  $L$  be the set of these pairs. Each such pair of points  $(p, q) \in L$  will signify a line  $\overline{pq}$  which will pass through  $p, q$ . We denote the slope of the line  $\overline{pq}$  as  $\alpha(\overline{pq})$ .

**STEP 1.2:** Consider the slopes of these  $\frac{|P_\ell \cup P_r|}{2}$  lines and compute their median. Let  $\alpha_m$  be the median slope.

**STEP 1.3:** Compute the supporting line of  $P_\ell$  and  $P_r$  with slope  $\alpha_m$ ; Suppose these are at points  $a(\in P_\ell)$  and  $b(\in P_r)$  respectively.

**STEP 1.4:** Now compare  $\alpha(\overline{ab})$  with  $\alpha_m$ . Here one of the three cases may arise: (i)  $\alpha(\overline{ab}) = \alpha_m$ , (ii)  $\alpha(\overline{ab}) < \alpha_m$  or (iii)  $\alpha(\overline{ab}) > \alpha_m$ .

**if**  $\alpha(\overline{ab}) = \alpha_m$  **then**

$\overline{ab}$  is the required bridge between the points in  $P_\ell$  and  $P_r$ . So, the procedure returns  $(a, b)$ .

**Otherwise**

    Decide whether  $\alpha(\overline{ab}) < \alpha_m$  or  $\alpha(\overline{ab}) > \alpha_m$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $\alpha(\overline{ab}) < \alpha_m$ , then we will consider all the pairs  $(p, q) \in L$  whose  $\alpha(\overline{pq}) \geq \alpha_m$ . We can ignore the one point among  $(p, q)$  which is to the left of the other one. So, at least  $\frac{|P_\ell \cup P_r|}{4}$  points are ignored for further consideration.

**STEP 2:**

Find the bridge in brute-force manner and return the bridge.

---

**Theorem 2.** *Given a set of  $n$  sorted points  $P$  of 2D in a read-only array, the convex-hull of  $P$  can be computed in  $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$  time using  $O(\log n)$  extra-space, where  $\sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}} < \epsilon < 1$ .*

**Reporting the hull-edges in-order** Now, we will show how to report the hull vertices in clock-wise order using no more than  $O(\log n)$  extra-space. Consider the recursion tree  $\mathcal{T}$  of the algorithm KS-UPPER-HULL. Its each node represents the reporting of a hull-edge. In the algorithm KS-UPPER-HULL, as the reporting is done according to pre-order traversal of the tree  $\mathcal{T}$ , the hull edges are not reported in clock-wise order. In order to report them in clock-wise order, we need to traverse the recursion tree in in-order manner, i.e. STEP 3 and STEP 4 of the Algorithm 1 should be in between STEP 5 and STEP 6. But, if we do this, then we can not evoke KS-UPPER-HULL( $P_\ell$ ) on the updated set  $P_\ell$ . To resolve this problem, we will compute the bridge in STEP 3 itself but will not report it then. We push it in the stack in STEP 3 and pop it from stack in between STEP 5 and STEP 6. The size of this stack depends on the depth of the recursion tree which is  $O(\log h)$ , where  $h$  is the number of hull-edges. The details of this change

---

**Algorithm 3:** READ-ONLY-UPPER-HULL( $start, end$ )

---

**Input:** A portion of read-only array  $P[start, \dots, end]$  containing points in 2D

sorted according to the  $x$ -coordinates

**Output:** The upper-hull for the points in  $P[start, \dots, end]$

**STEP 1:** Let  $m = \lceil \frac{end-start}{2} \rceil$ ; The point  $P[m] \in P[start, \dots, end]$  have the median  $x$ -coordinate;

**STEP 2:** (\* Now  $P_\ell = P[start, \dots, m]$  and  $P_r = P[m+1, \dots, end]$  \*)

**STEP 3:**  $(i, j) = \text{COMPUTE-BRIDGE}(start, m, end)$ ; (\* This procedure returns a pair of indices of points in array  $P$  that defines the bridge between  $P_\ell$  &  $P_r$  \*), Push the edge  $(P[i], P[j])$  in STACK;

**STEP 4:** (\* Modified  $P_\ell = P[start, \dots, i]$  and  $P_r = P[j, \dots, end]$  \*)

**STEP 5:** READ-ONLY-UPPER-HULL( $start, i$ );

**STEP 6:** Report the edge  $(P[i], P[j])$  popping the top element from STACK;

**STEP 7:** READ-ONLY-UPPER-HULL( $j, end$ );

---

is given as READ-ONLY-UPPER-HULL( $start, end$ ) in Algorithm 3. Thus we have the following result:

**Lemma 1.** *Given a set of  $n$  sorted points  $P$  in a read-only array, the reporting of the hull edges can be done in clock-wise order using only  $O(\log n)$  extra-space (assuming that the procedure COMPUTE-BRIDGE takes no more than  $O(\log n)$  space).*

**COMPUTE-BRIDGE with  $O(\log n)$  extra-space** Here the input set of points  $P$  of this procedure is first partitioned into two parts  $P_\ell$  and  $P_r$  by choosing the point  $P[m]$  having median  $x$ -coordinate. Since the array is sorted with respect to the  $x$ -coordinates, this needs  $O(1)$  time. Now an iterative procedure (while-loop) is executed to compute the bridge of  $P_\ell$  and  $P_r$ . In each iteration of the while-loop of the procedure COMPUTE-BRIDGE,  $\frac{1}{4}$ th of the points from the set  $P_\ell \cup P_r$  are pruned. The points which are pruned in  $i$ th iteration are not considered in any  $j$ th iteration, where  $j > i$ . After an iteration of the while-loop, either the bridge is returned or the iteration continues until  $|P_\ell| = 1$  or  $|P_r| = 1$ . So, the number of iterations of the while loop is  $O(\log n)$ , where  $n$  is the total number of points in  $P$ .

While executing the  $i$ th iteration, we want to remember the points which were pruned in the previous  $i - 1$  iterations,  $i \in \{1, \dots, \log n\}$ . If we use mark-bits to remember which points are valid/invalid, then we need  $O(n)$  bits. But, we have only  $O(\log n)$  work-space to be used. So, we take an array  $M$  of size  $O(\log n)$  and another bit-array  $B$  of size  $O(\log n)$ . At each  $i$ th iteration, ignoring all the pruned points, we pair the valid points and consider the slopes of all the lines defined by the paired points. We compute the median slope value  $\mu_i$  of these lines and store it at  $M[i]$ . If the supporting lines are at points  $a$  and  $b$ , we set

$B[i]$  as 1 or 0 depending on whether the slope  $\alpha(\overline{ab})$  is greater than or less than  $\mu_i$  (since  $\alpha(\overline{ab}) = \mu_i$  implies that we already get the bridge). Thus,  $B[i]$  signifies whether  $M[i]$  is greater than or less than the slope  $\alpha^*$  of the desired bridge.

Now, we will describe a pairing scheme which will satisfy the following invariants:

- Invariant 1** (i) If a point  $p$  is pruned at some iteration  $i$ , then it will not participate to form a pair for any  $j$ -th iteration, where  $j > i$ .
- (ii) If  $(p, q)$  are paired at the  $i$ -th iteration of the while-loop, and none of the points  $p, q$  is pruned at the end of this iteration and we need to go for  $i + 1$ -th iteration, then  $(p, q)$  will again form a valid pair at  $i + 1$ -th iteration.
- (iii) If  $(p, q)$  is a valid pair at  $i$ -th iteration and  $(p, s)$  ( $s \neq q$ ) are paired at  $i + 1$ -th iteration of the while-loop, then there exist some  $r$  such that  $(r, s)$  were paired at  $i$ -th iteration, and  $q$  and  $r$  were pruned at the end of  $i$ -th iteration.

The iteration starts with the points  $\{P[start], P[start + 1], \dots, P[end]\}$ . In the first iteration of the while-loop, we consider the consecutive points, i.e.,  $(P[start], P[start + 1])$ ,  $(P[start + 2], P[start + 3])$ ,  $\dots$  as valid pairs.

Assume that first  $i - 1$  iterations of the while-loop are over, and we are at the beginning of the  $i$ -th iteration;  $M[t]$  contains median slope of  $t$ -th iteration and  $B[t]$  contains 0 or 1 depending on  $M[t] > \alpha^*$  or  $M[t] < \alpha^*$  for all  $1 \leq t \leq i - 1$ . Now, we want to detect all the valid points and pair them up maintaining the Invariant 1. We use another array  $IndexP$  of size  $O(\log n)$  whose all elements are set to -1 at the beginning of this iteration.

We consider the point-pairs  $(P[start + 2\nu], P[start + 2\nu + 1])$ ,  $\nu = 0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{end - start + 1}{2} \rfloor$  in order. For each pair, we compute the slope  $\gamma = \alpha(\overline{P[start + 2\nu], P[start + 2\nu + 1]})$  of the corresponding line, and perform the level 1 test using  $M[1]$  and  $B[1]$  to see whether both of them remain *valid* at iteration 1. If the test succeeds, we perform level 2 test for  $\gamma$  by using  $M[2]$  and  $B[2]$ . We proceed similarly until (i) we reach up to  $i - 1$ -th level and both the points remain *valid* at all the levels, or (ii) one of these points becomes *invalid* at some level, say  $j$  ( $< i - 1$ ). In Case (i), the point pair  $(P[start + 2\nu], P[start + 2\nu + 1])$  will form a valid pair and participates in computing the median value  $m_i$ . In case (ii), suppose  $P[start + 2\nu]$  remains *valid* and  $P[start + 2\nu + 1]$  becomes *invalid*. Here two situations need to be considered depending on the value of  $IndexP[j]$ . If  $IndexP[j] = -1$  (no point is stored in  $IndexP[j]$ ), we store  $start + 2\nu$  or  $start + 2\nu + 1$  in  $IndexP[j]$  depending on whether  $P[start + 2\nu]$  or  $P[start + 2\nu + 1]$  remains *valid* at level  $j$ . If  $IndexP[j] = \beta (\neq -1)$  (index of a *valid* point), we form a pair  $(P[start + 2\nu], P[\beta])$  and proceed to check starting from  $j + 1$ -th level (i.e., using  $M[j + 1]$  and  $B[j + 1]$ ) onwards until it reaches the  $i$ -th level or one of them is marked *invalid* in some level between  $j$  and  $i$ . Both the situations are handled in a manner similar to Cases (i) and (ii) as stated above. Thus, each *valid* point in the  $i$ -th iteration has to qualify as a *valid* point in the tests of all the  $i - 1$

levels. For any other point the number of tests is at most  $i - 2$ . This leads to the following result:

**Lemma 2.** *In the  $i$ -th iteration, the amortized time complexity of finding all valid pairs is  $O(ni)$ .*

The main task in the  $i$ -th iteration is to find the median of the slope of lines corresponding to valid pair of points. We essentially use the median finding algorithm of Munro and Raman [10] for this purpose (see Appendix 1). Notice that, in order to get each slope, we need to get a *valid* pair of points, which takes  $O(i)$  time (see Lemma 2). The time required for finding the lowest slope is  $O(ni)$ . Similarly, computing the second lowest needs another  $O(ni)$  time. Proceeding similarly, the time complexity of the procedure  $\mathcal{A}_0$  of [10] is  $O(n^2i^2)$  (see the Appendix). Similarly,  $\mathcal{A}_1$  takes  $O(i^2n^{1+\frac{1}{2}} \log n)$  time, and so on. Finally,  $\mathcal{A}_k$  takes  $O(i^2n^{(1+\frac{1}{k+1})} \log^k n)$  time. Choosing  $k = \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}} < \log n$ , we need  $O(\log n)$  space in total. Thus, we have the following result:

**Lemma 3.** *The time complexity of the  $i$ -th iteration of the while-loop of the procedure COMPUTE-BRIDGE is  $O(i^2n^{(1+\frac{1}{k+1})} \log^k n)$ , where  $1 \leq k \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}}$ . The extra space required is  $O(\log n)$ .*

At the end of  $O(\log n)$  iterations, we could discard all the points except at most  $|IndexP| + 3$  points, where  $|IndexP|$  is the number of cells in the array  $IndexP$  that contain valid indices of  $P$  ( $\neq -1$ ). This can be at most  $O(\log n)$  in number. We can further prune the points in the  $IndexP$  array using the in-place algorithm for COMPUTE-BRIDGE described in [11]. Thus, we have the following result:

**Lemma 4.** *The read-only version of the procedure COMPUTE-BRIDGE is correct and the time complexity is  $O(n^{(1+\frac{1}{k+1})} \log^{k+3} n)$ , where where  $1 \leq k \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}}$ . Apart from the input array, it requires  $O(\log n)$  extra space.*

*Proof.* The correctness of this read-only version of the procedure COMPUTE-BRIDGE follows from the fact that the Invariant 1 is correctly maintained.

By Lemma 3, the time complexity of the  $i$ -th iteration is  $O(i^2n^{(1+\frac{1}{k+1})} \log^k n)$ , where  $i = 1, 2, \dots, \log n$ . Thus, the total time complexity of all the  $O(\log n)$  iterations is  $O(n^{(1+\frac{1}{k+1})} \log^{k+3} n)$ . The time required by the in-place algorithm for considering all the entries in the array  $IndexP$  is  $O(\log n)$ .

The space complexity obviously follows since the same set of arrays  $M$ ,  $B$ ,  $IndexP$  and the stack for finding the median can be used for all the iterations, and each one is of size at most  $O(\log n)$ .  $\square$



**Correctness and Complexity - Proof of Theorem 2** The correctness of the algorithm READ-ONLY-UPPER-HULL follows from the correctness of Kirkpatrick and Siedel's algorithm [8], as we are following the basic structure of this. The procedure COMPUTE-BRIDGE is evoked  $h$  times, where  $h$  is the number of hull-edges. Consider the recursion tree of the algorithm READ-ONLY-UPPER-HULL. Note that the depth of this tree is  $O(\log n)$  (more specifically,  $\log h$ ), and total time complexity of a single level is  $O(n^{(1+\frac{1}{k+1})} \log^{k+3} n)$ , where  $1 \leq k \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}}$  (see Lemma 4). As there are at most  $\log n$  levels, so the total time complexity of the algorithm READ-ONLY-UPPER-HULL is  $O(n^{(1+\frac{1}{k+1})} \log^{k+4} n)$ . Substituting  $\frac{\epsilon}{2} = \frac{1}{k+1}$  and then  $n^{\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \geq \log^{4+\frac{1}{\epsilon}} n$ , we have time complexity  $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$ , where  $\epsilon$  satisfies  $\sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}} < \epsilon < 1$ .

For the recursion of READ-ONLY-UPPER-HULL we need  $\log n$  space and for each node of the recursion tree we need another  $O(\log n)$  space for the procedure COMPUTE-BRIDGE. However, we can re-use the same space for each of the nodes for computing the bridge. Hence the total space complexity of the algorithm READ-ONLY-UPPER-HULL is  $O(\log n)$ .

### 3 2D Linear Programming

In this section, we consider the problem of solving 2D linear programming in a read-only setup, i.e, the constraints are given in a memory where swapping of elements or modifying any entry is not permissible. Megiddo proposed a linear time prune-and-search algorithm for this problem which takes  $O(n)$  space [9]. We will show that Megiddo's algorithm for 2D linear programming can be implemented when the constraints are stored in a read-only memory using  $O(\log n)$  extra-space and the running time would be  $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$ , where  $\sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}} < \epsilon < 1$ .

#### 3.1 Overview of Megiddo's 2D Linear Programming

The 2D linear programming problem is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{x_1, x_2} c_1 x_1 + c_2 x_2 \\ \text{subject to:} & \quad a'_i x_1 + b'_i x_2 \geq \beta_i, i \in I = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned}$$

For ease of designing a linear time algorithm, Megiddo transformed it to an equivalent form, stated below:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{x, y} y \\ \text{subject to:} & \quad y \geq a_i x + b_i, i \in I_1, \\ & \quad y \leq a_i x + b_i, i \in I_2, \\ & \quad |I_1| + |I_2| \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

Megiddo's 2D linear programming algorithm uses prune-and-search technique. It maintains an interval  $[a, b]$  of feasible values of  $x$  (i.e.,  $a \leq x \leq b$ ). At the

---

**Algorithm 4:** MEGIDDO'S-2D-LP( $I, c_1, c_2$ )

---

**Input:** A set of  $n$  constraints  $a'_i x_1 + b'_i x_2 \geq \beta_i$ , for  $i \in I = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ,

**Output:** The value of  $x_1, x_2$  which minimizes  $c_1 x_1 + c_2 x_2$

\*(Uses prune-and-search technique)\*

**STEP 1:** Convert the form into the following:  $\min_{x,y} y$ , subject to

(i)  $y \geq a_i x + b_i$ ,  $i \in I_1$ , (ii)  $y \leq a_i x + b_i$ ,  $i \in I_2$ , where  $|I_1| + |I_2| \leq n$ .

**STEP 2:** Set  $a = -\infty$  and  $b = \infty$ ;

**while**  $|I_1 \cup I_2| > 4$  **do**

**STEP 2.1:** Arbitrarily pair-up the constraints of  $I_1$  (resp.  $I_2$ ). Let  $M_1$  (resp.  $M_2$ ) be the set of aforesaid pairs, where  $|M_1| = \lfloor \frac{|I_1|}{2} \rfloor$  and  $|M_2| = \lfloor \frac{|I_2|}{2} \rfloor$ . Each pair of constraints in  $M_1 \cup M_2$  are denoted by  $(i, j)$  where  $i$  and  $j$  indicate the  $i$ -th and  $j$ -th constraints.

**STEP 2.2:**

**for each pair**  $(i, j) \in M_1 \cup M_2$  **do**

**if**  $a_i \neq a_j$  **then** Compute  $x_{ij} = \frac{b_i - b_j}{a_j - a_i}$ ;

        Find the median  $x_m$  among all  $x_{ij}$ 's which are in the interval  $[a, b]$  ;

**STEP 2.3:** Test whether optimum  $x^*$  satisfies  $x^* = x_m$  or  $x^* > x_m$  or  $x^* < x_m$  as follows:

**STEP 2.3.1:** Compute  $g = \max_{i \in I_1} a_i x_m + b_i$ ;  $h = \min_{i \in I_2} a_i x_m + b_i$ ;

**STEP 2.3.2:** Compute

$s_g = \min_{a_i | i \in I_1, a_i x_m + b_i = g}$ ;  $S_g = \max_{a_i | i \in I_1, a_i x_m + b_i = g}$ ;

$s_h = \min_{a_i | i \in I_2, a_i x_m + b_i = h}$ ;  $S_h = \max_{a_i | i \in I_2, a_i x_m + b_i = h}$ ;

**STEP 2.3.2:** (\*  $g \leq h \Rightarrow x_m$  is feasible ;  $g > h \Rightarrow x_m$  in infeasible region \*)

**if**  $g > h$  **then**

**if**  $s_g > S_h$  **then** (\*  $x_m < x^*$  \*)  $b = x_m$

**if**  $S_g < s_h$  **then** (\*  $x_m > x^*$  \*)  $a = x_m$

**else** Report there is no feasible solution of the LP problem; **Exit**

**else**

**if**  $s_g > 0$  &  $s_g \geq S_h$  **then** (\*  $x_m < x^*$  \*)  $b = x_m$

**if**  $S_g < 0$  &  $S_g \leq s_h$  **then** (\*  $x_m > x^*$  \*)  $a = x_m$

**else** Report optimum solution  $x_1 = x_m$  &  $x_2 = \frac{g - c_1 x_1}{c_2}$ ; **Exit**

**STEP 2.4:** \*(Pruning step - The case where iteration continues.

        Without loss of generality Assume that  $x^* > x_m$ ; \*)

**for each pair**  $(i, j) \in M_1 \cup M_2$  **do**

**If**  $a_i = a_j$  **then** Ignore one of the two constraints;

**If**  $a_i \neq a_j$  and  $x_{ij} < x_m$  **then** Ignore one of the two constraints;

**STEP 3:** \*(The case when  $|I_1 \cup I_2| \leq 4$ )\*

The problem can be solved directly.

---

beginning of the algorithm,  $a = -\infty$  and  $b = \infty$ . After each iteration of the algorithm, either it finds out that at some  $x = x_m$  ( $a \leq x_m \leq b$ ) the optimal solution exist (so the algorithm stops) or the interval  $[a, b]$  is redefined (the new interval is either  $[a, x_m]$  or  $[x_m, b]$ ) and at least  $\frac{n}{4}$  constraints are pruned for the next iteration. The detail steps of the algorithm is given in the algorithm MEGIDDO'S-2D-LP( $I, c_1, c_2$ ).

Megiddo's 2D linear programming algorithm needs  $O(n)$  time and  $O(n)$  space. In the next subsection we will show how to tailor this algorithm to work in the read-only setup such that it does not take more than  $O(\log n)$  space and running time is  $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$ , where  $\sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}} < \epsilon < 1$ .

### 3.2 2D-Linear Programming in Read-only setup

We will give step by step description of implementing MEGIDDO'S-2D-LP in a read-only setup. The straight-forward conversion of one form into another mentioned in STEP 1 would take  $O(n)$  extra-space. Note that remembering only the objective function  $y = c_1x_1 + c_2x_2$ , will enable one to reformulate the newer version of the constraints on-the-fly substituting  $x_2$  in terms of  $x_1$  and  $y$  (replacing  $x_1$  by  $x$ ) in each constraint. So, we need not to worry about storing this new form. It is also to be noted that 2D linear programming can be implemented in an in-place model in  $O(n)$  time using  $O(1)$  extra-space [5]. So, we can implement the pruning activities in Step 2 in read-only environment in a manner similar to COMPUTE-BRIDGE as described in section 2.2 using  $O(\log n)$  space and  $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$  time, where  $\epsilon$  satisfies  $\sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}} < \epsilon < 1$ . Step 3 can obviously be implemented when the constraints are given in a read-only memory. Hence, we have the following result:

**Theorem 3.** *2D linear programming can be implemented in a read-only model in  $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$  time using  $O(\log n)$  extra-space, where  $\sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}} < \epsilon < 1$ .*

## 4 3D Linear Programming

In the same paper [9] Megiddo proposed a linear time algorithm for 3D linear programming. The problem is stated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{x_1, x_2, x_3} d_1x_1 + d_2x_2 + d_3x_3 \\ \text{subject to:} & \quad a'_i x_1 + b'_i x_2 + c'_i x_3 \geq \beta_i, i \in I = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned}$$

As earlier, Megiddo transformed the problem into the following equivalent form:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{x, y, z} z \\ \text{subject to:} & \quad z \geq a_i x + b_i y + c_i, i \in I_1, \\ & \quad z \leq a_i x + b_i y + c_i, i \in I_2, \\ & \quad 0 \geq a_i x + b_i y + c_i, i \in I_3, \\ & \quad |I_1| + |I_2| + |I_3| \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

MEGIDDO's-3D-LP algorithm also follows prune-and-search paradigm. It pairs-up constraints  $(C_k^i, C_k^j)$  where  $C_k^i, C_k^j$  are from same set  $I_k, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ; So, there are at most  $\frac{n}{2}$  pairs. Let  $C_k^i$  (resp.  $C_k^j$ ) corresponds to  $a_i x + b_i y + c_i$  (resp.  $a_j x + b_j y + c_j$ ). If  $(a_i, b_i) = (a_j, b_j)$ , then we can easily ignore one of the constraints. Otherwise (i.e., if  $(a_i, b_i) \neq (a_j, b_j)$ ), then each pair signifies a line  $L_{ij}: a_i x + b_i y + c_i = a_j x + b_j y + c_j$  which divides the plane into two halves. Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the set of lines obtained in this way. We compute the median  $\mu$  of the gradients of the members in  $\mathcal{L}$ . Next, we pair-up the members in  $\mathcal{L}$  such that one of them have gradient less than  $\mu$  and the other one have gradient greater than  $\mu$ . Let  $\Pi$  be the set of these paired lines. Each of these pairs will intersect. We compute the intersection point  $a$  having median  $y_m$  among the  $y$ -coordinates of these intersection points. Next, we execute the procedure TESTING-LINE as stated below with respect to the line  $L_H: y = \mu x + y_m \sqrt{\mu^2 + 1}$  (having gradient  $\mu$  and passing through  $a$ ). This determines in which side of  $L_H$  the optimum solution lies. Next, we identify the pairs in  $\Pi$  which intersect on the other side of the optimum solution. Among these pairs, we compute the intersection point  $b$  having median  $x$ -coordinates of their intersections, and execute TESTING-LINE with the line  $L_V$  having gradient  $\frac{1}{\mu}$  and passing through  $b$ .  $L_H$  and  $L_V$  determines a quadrant  $Q$  containing the optimum solution. Now consider the paired lines in  $\Pi$  that intersect in the quadrant  $Q'$ , diagonally opposite to  $Q$ . Let  $(L_{ij}, L_{k\ell})$  be a paired line of  $\Pi$  that intersect in  $Q'$ . For at least one of the lines  $L_{ij}$  and  $L_{k\ell}$ , it is possible to correctly identify the side containing the optimum solution without executing TESTING-LINE (see [9]). Thus, for each of such lines we can prune one constraint. As a result, after each iteration it can prune at-least  $\frac{n}{16}$  constraints for next iteration or report optimum.

The procedure TESTING-LINE takes a straight line  $L$  in the  $x$ - $y$  plane and tests whether the solution on the line  $L$  (i) does not exist, or (ii) unbounded, or (iii) unique optimum solution exists using a 2D linear programming. In Case (ii), the solution of the given 3D linear programming problem is unbounded. In Case (i) and (iii), we need to decide in which side of  $L$  the optimum solution of the given linear programming problem lies by executing two other 2D linear programming. Both of them can be executed if the constraints are given in read-only memory.

The detail description of the algorithm MEGIDDO's-3D-LP is given in Appendix 2. As MEGIDDO's-3D-LP is a *prune-and-search* algorithm, one can easily show that this can be implemented in a read-only setup. Thus, we have the following result:

**Theorem 4.** *3D linear programming can be implemented in a read-only model in  $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$  time using  $O(\log n)$  extra-space, where  $\sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}} < \epsilon < 1$ .*

## References

1. T. Asano, W. Mulzer, G. Rote, and Y. Wang. Constant-work-space algorithms for geometric problems. *JoCG*, 2(1):46–68, 2011.
2. L. Barba, M. Korman, S. Langerman, K. Sadakane, and R. I. Silveira. Space-time trade-offs for stack-based algorithms. *CoRR*, abs/1208.3663, 2012.
3. H. Blunck and J. Vahrenhold. In-place algorithms for computing (layers of) maxima. *Algorithmica*, 57(1):1–21, 2010.
4. P. Bose, A. Maheshwari, P. Morin, J. Morrison, M. H. M. Smid, and J. Vahrenhold. Space-efficient geometric divide-and-conquer algorithms. *Comput. Geom.*, 37(3):209–227, 2007.
5. H. Brönnimann, J. Iacono, J. Katajainen, P. Morin, J. Morrison, and G. T. Toussaint. In-place planar convex hull algorithms. In *LATIN*, pages 494–507, 2002.
6. T. M. Chan and E. Y. Chen. Multi-pass geometric algorithms. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 37(1):79–102, 2007.
7. M. De, S. C. Nandy, and S. Roy. Minimum enclosing circle with few extra variables. In *FSTTCS*, 2012.
8. D. G. Kirkpatrick and R. Seidel. The ultimate planar convex hull algorithm? *SIAM J. Comput.*, 15(1):287–299, 1986.
9. N. Megiddo. Linear-time algorithms for linear programming in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and related problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 12(4):759–776, 1983.
10. J. I. Munro and V. Raman. Selection from read-only memory and sorting with minimum data movement. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 165(2):311–323, 1996.
11. J. Vahrenhold. On the space efficiency of the “ultimate planar convex hull algorithm”. In *CCCG*, pages 131–136, 2012.

## Appendix 1

**Munro and Raman's median finding algorithm:** Given a set of  $n$  real numbers in a read-only array  $P$ , the algorithm in [10] for finding their median is designed by using a set of procedures  $\mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k$ , where procedure  $\mathcal{A}_i$  finds the median by evoking the procedure  $\mathcal{A}_{i-1}$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ . The procedures  $\mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k$  are stated below.

**Procedure  $\mathcal{A}_0$ :** In the first iteration, after checking all the elements in  $P$ , it finds the largest element  $p_{(1)}$  in linear time. In the second iteration it finds the second largest  $p_{(2)}$  by checking only the elements which are less than  $p_{(1)}$ . Proceeding in this way, in the  $j$ -th iteration it finds the  $j$ -th largest element  $p_{(j)}$  considering all the elements in  $P$  that are less than  $p_{(j-1)}$ . In order to get the median we need to proceed up to  $j = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ . Thus, this simple median finding algorithm takes  $O(n^2)$  time and  $O(1)$  extra-space.

**Procedure  $\mathcal{A}_1$ :** It divides the array  $P$  into blocks of size  $\sqrt{n}$  and in each block it finds the median using Procedure  $\mathcal{A}_0$ . After computing the median  $m$  of a block, it counts the number of elements in  $P$  that are smaller than  $m$ , denoted by  $\rho(m)$ , by checking all the elements in the array  $P$ . It maintains two best block medians  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ , where  $\rho(m_1) = \max\{\rho(m) \mid \rho(m) \leq \frac{n}{2}\}$ , and  $\rho(m_2) = \min\{\rho(m) \mid \rho(m) \geq \frac{n}{2}\}$ . Thus, this iteration needs  $O(n\sqrt{n})$  time.

After this iteration, all the elements  $P[i]$  satisfying  $P[i] < m_1$  or  $P[i] > m_2$  are marked as *invalid*. This does not need any mark bit; only one needs to remember  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ . In the next iteration we again consider same set of blocks, and compute the median ignoring the *invalid* elements.

Since, in each iteration  $\frac{1}{4}$  fraction of the existing *valid* elements are marked *invalid*, we need at most  $O(\log n)$  iterations to find the median  $\mu$ . Thus the time complexity of this procedure is  $O(n\sqrt{n} \log n)$ .

**Procedure  $\mathcal{A}_2$ :** It divides the whole array into  $n^{1/3}$  blocks each of size  $n^{2/3}$ , and computes the block median using the procedure  $\mathcal{A}_1$ . Thus, the overall time complexity of this procedure for computing the median is  $n^{1+\frac{1}{3}} \log^2 n$ .

Proceeding in this way, the time complexity of the procedure  $\mathcal{A}_k$  will be  $O(n^{(1+\frac{1}{k+1})} \log^k n)$ . As it needs a stack of depth  $k$  for the recursive evoking of  $\mathcal{A}_{k-1}, \mathcal{A}_{k-2}, \dots, \mathcal{A}_0$ , the space complexity of this algorithm is  $O(k)$ .

Setting  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{k+1}$ , gives the running time as  $O(\frac{n^{1+\epsilon} \log^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} n}{\log n})$ . If we choose  $n^\epsilon = \log^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}} n$ , then  $\epsilon$  will be  $\sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}}$ , and this will give the running time  $O(\frac{n^{1+2\epsilon}}{\log n})$ , which is of  $O(n^{1+2\epsilon})$ . So, the general result is as follows:

**Result 1** *For a set of  $n$  points in  $\mathbb{R}$  given in a read-only memory, the median can be found in  $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$  time with  $O(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$  extra-space, where  $2\sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}} \leq \epsilon < 1$ .*

---

**Algorithm 5:** Appendix 2 - MEGIDDO'S-3D-LP( $I, c_1, c_2$ )

---

**Input:** A set of  $n$  constraints  $a'_i x_1 + b'_i x_2 + c'_i x_3 \geq \beta_i$ , for  $i \in I = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ,

**Output:** The value of  $x_1, x_2$  which minimizes  $c_1 x_1 + c_2 x_2$

(\* Uses prune-and-search technique \*)

**STEP 1:** Convert the form into following:  $\min_{x,y,z} z$ , subject to (i)

$y \geq a_i x + b_i y + c_i$ ,  $i \in I_1$ , (ii)  $y \leq a_i x + b_i y + c_i$ ,  $i \in I_2$ , (iii)  $0 \geq a_i x + b_i y + c_i$ ,  
 $i \in I_3$ , where  $|I_1| + |I_2| + |I_3| \leq n$ .

**STEP 2:**

**while**  $|I_1 \cup I_2 \cup I_3| \geq 16$  **do**

**STEP 2.1:** Arbitrarily pair-up the constraints  $a_i x + b_i y + c_i$ ,  $a_j x + b_j y + c_j$  where  $i, j$  are from same set  $I_k, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2$  and  $\mathcal{L}_3$  be the set of aforesaid pairs and  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1 \cup \mathcal{L}_2 \cup \mathcal{L}_3$ .

**STEP 2.2:** Let  $\mathcal{L}_C = \{(i, j) \in \mathcal{L} | (a_i, b_i) \neq (a_j, b_j)\}$  and

$\mathcal{L}_P = \{(i, j) \in \mathcal{L} | (a_i, b_i) = (a_j, b_j)\}$ ;

    Compute the median  $\mu$  of the slopes  $\alpha(L_{ij})$  of all the straight lines  $L_{ij}$ :

$a_i x + b_i y + c_i = a_j x + b_j y + c_j$ ,  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{L}_C$ ;

**STEP 2.3:**

    Arbitrarily pair up  $(L_{ij}, L_{i'j'})$  where  $\alpha(L_{ij}) \leq \mu \leq \alpha(L_{i'j'})$  and

$(i, j), (i', j') \in \mathcal{L}_C$ . Let  $M$  be the set of these  $\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor$  pairs of lines;

    Let  $M_P = \{(L_i, L_j) \in M | \alpha(L_i) = \alpha(L_j) = \mu\}$  (\* parallel line-pairs \*) and

$M_I = \{(L_i, L_j) \in M | \alpha(L_i) \neq \alpha(L_j)\}$  (\* intersecting line-pairs \*);

**for each pair**  $(L_i, L_j) \in M_P$  **do**

        | compute  $y_{ij} = \frac{d_i + d_j}{2}$ , where  $d_i =$  distance of  $L_i$  from the line  $y = \mu x$

**for each pair**  $(L_i, L_j) \in M_I$  **do**

        | Let  $a_{ij} =$  point of intersection of  $L_i$  &  $L_j$ , and  $b_{ij} =$  projection of  $a_{ij}$  on

        |  $y = \mu x$ . Compute  $y_{ij} =$  signed distance of the pair of points  $(a_{ij}, b_{ij})$ ,

        | and  $x_{ij} =$  signed distance of  $b_{ij}$  from the origin;

    Next, compute the median  $y_m$  of the  $y_{ij}$  values corresponding to all the pairs in  $M$ ;

**Step 2.4:** Consider the line  $L_H : y = \mu x + y_m \sqrt{\mu^2 + 1}$ , which is parallel to  $y = \mu x$  and at a distance  $y_m$  from  $y = \mu x$ ;

    Test on which half-plane defined by the line  $L_H$  contains the optimum by evoking TESTING-LINE( $L_H$ )

**Step 2.5:** Let  $M'_I = \{(L_i, L_j) \in M_I | a_{ij} \text{ \& } \pi^* \text{ lie in different sides of } L_H\}$ ;

    Compute the median  $x_m$  of  $x_{ij}$ -values for the line-pairs in  $M'_I$ . Define a line

$L_V$  perpendicular to  $y = \mu x$  and passing through a point on  $y = \mu x$  at a distance  $x_m$  from the origin;

    Execute the procedure TESTING-LINE( $L_V$ ) and decide in which side of  $L_V$  the optimum lies;

    We consider  $L_H$  and  $L_V$  as horizontal and vertical lines respectively;

    W.L.O.G., assume that optimum lies in the top-left quadrant;

**Step 2.6:** (\* Pruning step \*)

**for all the members**  $(L_i, L_j) \in M_I$  **whose points of intersection**  $(a_{ij})$  **lie in the bottom-right quadrant do**

        | Discard one of the four constraints defined by the pair of lines  $L_i, L_j$

**for all the members**  $(L_i, L_j) \in M_P$  **whose**  $y_{ij} \leq y_m$  **do**

        | Discard one of the four constraints defined by the pair of lines  $L_i, L_j$

**STEP 3:** \*(The case when  $|I_1 \cup I_2 \cup I_3| \leq 16$ )\*

The problem can be solved directly by brute-force manner.

---