Structured Discrete Shape Approximation: Theoretical Complexity and Practical Algorithm

Andreas M. Tillmann^{*} Leif Kobbelt[†]

June 3, 2022

Abstract

We consider the problem of approximating a two-dimensional shape contour (or curve segment) using discrete assembly systems, which allow to build geometric structures based on limited sets of node and edge types subject to edge length and orientation restrictions. We show that already deciding feasibility of such approximation problems is NP-hard, and remains intractable even for very simple setups. We then devise an algorithmic framework that combines shape sampling with exact cardinality-minimization to obtain good approximations using few components. As a particular application and showcase example, we discuss approximating shape contours using the classical Zometool construction kit and provide promising computational results, demonstrating that our algorithm is capable of obtaining good shape representations within reasonable time, in spite of the problem's general intractability. We conclude the paper with an outlook on possible extensions of the developed methodology, in particular regarding 3D shape approximation tasks.

1 Introduction and Preliminaries

We are interested in approximately representing two-dimensional shape contours by planar structures that consist of a limited variety of edge and node types which can be connected only in certain, finitely many ways. The two main goals of this general task are simplicity of the structure (i.e., using a small number of components) and good approximation quality with respect to the input contour. Aiming at a good tradeoff between these somewhat conflicting goals gives rise to many possible formulations, e.g., minimizing the number of components while observing a given approximation error tolerance or, conversely, minimizing the approximation error under component budget constraints. Such problem settings are highly relevant in technical applications where scaffolds or custom support structures are built from a small variety of standard beams and connectors in order to reduce fabrication costs ("rationalization"). These structures are often made by assembling sets of (parallel) 2D profiles. This motivates to initially focus on the case of 2D contour approximation; we will remark on possibilities to exploit the methodology introduced here for generalized setups in 2D and 3D in the conclusions.

To set the stage, we define a discrete assembly system (DAS) as $\mathcal{G} := (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D})$, where \mathcal{V} is a set of node types $(n := |\mathcal{V}|)$, \mathcal{E} a set of edge types $(m := |\mathcal{E}|)$, $\mathcal{B} := \{b_e \in \mathbb{Z}_+ : e \in \mathcal{E}\}$ contains (optional) availability budgets for each edge type (which may be infinite), and $\mathcal{D} := \{(d_i, V_i, E_i) : V_i \subseteq \mathcal{V}, E_i \subseteq \mathcal{E}, i = 1, \dots, k\}$ is a collection of k possible (edge) orientations d_i (given, e.g., by direction vectors in \mathbb{R}^2) along with node types V_i and edge types E_i that are compatible with d_i , i.e., to a node $v \in V_i$, an edge $e \in E_i$ can be attached with orientation d_i . (Note that this setup makes the implicit assumption that all nodes of one type have the same orientation in space; in principle, this could be generalized by equipping each V_i with a local coordinate system, but we do not treat such extensions here.) In particular, generally, not every orientation is allowed at every node, and not every edge type is allowed for every orientation. We call a DAS construction valid if it corresponds to a "planar" structure (i.e., edges are not allowed to overlap or cross one another) and the edge type budgets are adhered to.

Formalizing and realizing the vague task of "finding good approximations" of a given shape contour $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ (or curve segment $\mathcal{C}(p_1, p_2) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ between two points $p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$) by means of a DAS \mathcal{G} poses several challenges. Indeed, to even precisely define a concrete mathematical problem already involves some nontrivial (design) choices. Besides deciding on how to balance the aforementioned two main goals of structural simplicity and approximation quality, one has to choose a measure for the approximation error,

^{*}A. M. Tillmann is with the Visual Computing Institute and the Chair of Operations Research at RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany (e-mail: andreas.tillmann@cs.rwth-aachen.de).

 $^{^{\}dagger}$ L. Kobbelt is with the Visual Computing Institute, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany (e-mail: kobbelt@cs.rwth-aachen.de)

deal with the combinatorial "explosion" induced by the discrete setup, and decide on how to handle global positioning and rotation (fixed vs. variable) as well as scaling w.r.t. the input shape. Furthermore, it has to be ensured that the sought DAS construction "follows" the given shape contour (i.e., that it is " \mathcal{F} -resembling") and is planar. Moreover, note also that any approximation error induced by a \mathcal{G} -representation of \mathcal{F} (say, $G(\mathcal{F})$) or even a single edge cannot be computed without knowing its actual spacial position (relative to \mathcal{F}), which, however, is generally not available a priori.

To nevertheless get a grip on the task, we propose to divide the problem into a "feasibility part" and an "optimality part". The general idea is to first find a feasible \mathcal{F} -resembling \mathcal{G} -representation and then rearrange its edges to reduce the approximation error as far as (locally) possible. To ensure \mathcal{F} -resemblance, we sample the input shape and require the DAS construction to place nodes close to the sample points and to connect neighboring pairs of those nodes by a \mathcal{G} -segment. Based on the simple observation that long \mathcal{G} -paths (with many edges, say $m_{\mathcal{G}}$) between two points will ultimately (for $m_{\mathcal{G}} \to \infty$) deviate strongly from any possible given curve segment between the two points, we use the number of DAS edges between two neighboring nodes as a proxy for the approximation error to minimize in this step. Relating this three-phase approach (sampling being phase one) to the two conflicting goals mentioned earlier, we thus incorporate the goal of simplicity into the second phase by means of minimizing the number of utilized DAS components, and explicitly address the goal of low approximation error in the third phase.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: In the following two subsections, we first discuss related problems from the literature, and then describe a concrete DAS—the so-called Zometool system—that will serve as a showcase example throughout the remainder of the paper, and for which we demonstrate the practicability of our method with computational experiments (presented in Section 4). We formally define several shape contour approximation and point connectivity feasibility problems and prove their respective NP-hardness in Section 2, before providing (in Section 3) a detailed description of the approach that was briefly outlined above. We conclude the paper with a discussion of some unresolved aspects and possible ways to utilize the methodology developed here for the even more challenging 3D shape approximation problem, thus providing pointers for interesting future research.

1.1 Related Work

In the literature, one can find many problems that are in one way or another related to the approximation of some given shape contour or curve segment between two points by the discrete assembly systems considered in the present paper. We will briefly outline what appear to be the most closely related works in the following. Notably, to the best of our knowledge, our key feature of *finitely many edge types/lengths* is missing in all related previous works, with the exception of those involving Zometool systems (formally described in the next subsection), and there appears to be no clear way to integrate it into any of the algorithmic schemes developed therein.

- Minimum-Link Paths. Here, the problem is to find a path within a given (often polygonal) shape between two specified points that uses as few edges as possible (equivalently, the fewest turns). Optimization is usually done w.r.t. link (edge) number and/or total path length (often Euclidean, but other distance measures have been considered). Possible constraints include, in particular, a discrete set of admissible edge orientations, but edges may be arbitrarily long. Related further problems include ray-shooting variants (turns are restricted to "reflection" at the shape boundary), art gallery and watchman route problems, robot motion planning problems (finding paths that avoid obstacles) or VLSI routing. A comprehensive overview of minimum-link path related problems and algorithms is given in the very recent survey [11] (and the extensive list of references therein); for a select sample of works, see [8, 2, 18, 12, 15, 9, 14, 19, 3].
- **Polygonal Approximation.** Here, the problem is often to approximate a given polygon by a "simpler" one, though other (often convex) shapes are sometimes also considered, and objectives may be minimizing the enclosed area or the perimeter of the constructed polygonal shape, see, for instance, [6, 17, 13, 1]. As with minimum-link paths, edge type (length) restrictions appear to have not been considered in this context.
- **Zometool Shape Approximation.** The special DAS case of Zometool systems (cf. Section 1.2 below) and corresponding shape approximation problems in 3D space have been considered in, e.g. [4, 7, 20, 21]. The latter two works use a simulated annealing approach (based on local configuration improvements) to approximate a shape boundary in \mathbb{R}^3 that could be adopted to work in two dimensions as well. However, the simulated annealing methodology does not provide any convergence or approximation/optimality guarantees, and may exhibit considerable runtime in practice. These drawbacks partly motivated our developing the method proposed in Section 3, which differs in that it involves

high-level heuristic model/design choices—in particular, the sampling phase—but solves the resulting subproblems to global optimality (not restricted to local improvement sequences); moreover, the global positioning of the \mathcal{G} -construction is included in the optimization here, but fixed in the simulated annealing approach.

Although a future "ultimate" goal is to refine and improve upon solving shape approximation problems in three dimensions, we focus on the 2D case throughout this paper in order to establish theoretical hardness results and a novel algorithmic framework. The former carry over directly to the 3D case, thus settling the open question of computational complexity in that regime as well, while we intend to utilize the latter for handling the 3D setting in future work (see Section 5 for some remarks in that regard). For such an extension, local improvement steps as employed by the simulated annealing algorithm from [20, 21] may become useful as heuristics or solution polishing components.

There exist very many more problems that are in one way or another loosely related to discrete assembly system shape approximation, such as similar path-problems with prescribed angles at the turns or minimizing total turn angle, restrictions to grid-like graph-related structures, curve smoothing approaches, visibility polytopes, or skeleton graph computation. As these are less relevant to the present work, we do not go into more detail here. Similarly, the body of literature on (3D) shape approximation in general is too vast to discuss here, and arguably not directly relevant; also, again, the combined specifics of our DAS seem to set it apart from other approaches.

1.2 The Zometool System

A particular discrete assembly system that exists as a real-world construction kit is the Zome(tool) system $\mathcal{Z} := (\mathcal{V}^{\mathcal{Z}}, \mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{Z}}, \mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{Z}}, \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Z}}), \text{ cf., e.g., [7]}.$ Here, we have only one type of nodes, so $n^{\mathcal{Z}} = |\mathcal{V}^{\mathcal{Z}}| = 1; \text{ say, } \mathcal{V}^{\mathcal{Z}} = \{z\}.$ This node type is originally defined in 3D, where it has a total of 62 slots at which edges of different types (referred to as struts in this context) can be attached -12 pentagonal slots, into which only red struts fit, 20 triangular slots for yellow struts and 30 rectangular slots for blue struts. The most versatile node type in 2D, derived from the 3D node type by slicing it so that as many slots as possible remain, still has 12 slots (corresponding to orientations in the form of 6 directions and their respective opposites), with 4 struts per color attachable to it in total (2 orientations per color). For each color, three lengths are available (defined as the distance between the midpoints of the two nodes a strut can connect). Thus, in total, there are nine types of struts $\mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{Z}} = \mathcal{E}_r^{\mathcal{Z}} \cup \mathcal{E}_y^{\mathcal{Z}} \cup \mathcal{E}_b^{\mathcal{Z}}$, with $\mathcal{E}_c^{\mathcal{Z}} = \{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ for each color $c \in \mathcal{C} \coloneqq \{r, y, b\}$ (r for red, y for yellow, b for blue), where w.l.o.g. the length of c_i is smaller than that of c_j whenever i < j. In particular, for each strut type, the lengths are related via the golden ratio $\phi \coloneqq (1 + \sqrt{5})/2 \approx 1.618$ as follows: Identifying, for simplicity, each c_i directly with its length (so that $c_1 < c_2 < c_3$ for all $c \in C$), the medium length is then given as $c_2 = \phi c_1$ and the longest as $c_3 = \phi c_2$. Note that since $\phi^2 = 1 + \phi$, we have $c_3 = c_1 + c_2$. Further nice properties exhibited by the Zome system are node symmetry (i.e., for each slot to plug in a strut, there is an opposite slot of the same type in the Zome node z, so for each direction, the opposite direction is also available) and a fixed node orientation (i.e., all nodes have the same orientation in space, defined by any one strut used in the assembled Zome structure). Moreover, assuming w.l.o.g. a scaling such that $b_0 = 2$ and that a Zome node is placed at the origin (0,0) (or (0,0,0) for 3-dimensional setups), the coordinates of each point that can be reached via Zometool components have the form $(\alpha_1 + \phi\beta_1, \alpha_2 + \phi\beta_2)$ (or $(\alpha_1 + \phi\beta_1, \alpha_2 + \phi\beta_2, \alpha_3 + \phi\beta_3)$ in the 3D case), where $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$ (or $\{1, 2, 3\}$, respectively). It is worth emphasizing that the listed properties are special to the Zome system and will not (in analogous form) hold for arbitrary DASs in general. However, if we further restrict to a Zome subsystem by excluding certain strut lengths and/or types, the properties are retained and, naturally, further structural properties can be observed. Furthermore, note that any Zome path is invariant under permutations of its elements in the sense that the two nodes connected by the path are also connected by all other paths that contain the same struts in an arbitrarily permuted order. (This invariance actually does hold for all DASs.)

Based on this scaling $(b_0 = 2)$, all other Zome strut lengths are determined as well; Figure 1 provides an overview of the corresponding edge types in the 2D Zome system which offers the largest admissible set of strut orientations. It is worth mentioning that there also exist green Zome struts, leading from the origin to (2, 2), $(2\phi, 2\phi)$ and $(2 + 2\phi, 2 + 2\phi)$, respectively; these are part of an *extended Zome system* which retains the properties of the basic system but naturally allows for even more variety in constructions. Nevertheless, for simplicity, we restrict ourselves to the standard Zome system throughout.

Further details on the Zome system, local configurations and construction examples can be found in [4, 7]; in particular, see also the Zometool shape approximation algorithms based on simulated annealing in [20, 21].



Figure 1: The different Zometool struts and their lengths and orientations (implicitly) in the most versatile twodimensional Zome system. Strut thicknesses differ for visualization purposes only. Global (node) orientation is 0° .

2 Formal Problem Statements and Computational Complexity

In this section, we provide strong intractability results for several essential discrete (2D) shape contour and curve segment approximation problems. In fact, it will turn out that already deciding feasibility is NP-hard, so our complexity results hold regardless of any objective function. Since no theoretically efficient (i.e., polynomial-time) solution methods exists unless P=NP, such intractability results motivate the development of fast heuristics or, possibly, polynomial-time approximation algorithms (with provable guarantees on the solution quality w.r.t. optimality), as well as dedicated exact (but exponential-time) solvers. Thus, ultimately, they provide justification for the mixed-integer programming based approach we propose later (see Section 3) and, retrospectively, also for the simulated annealing heuristic from [20, 21] for (3D) Zometool shape approximation.

2.1 DAS Shape Approximation (Feasibility) Problems

Let us begin with formal definitions of the problems considered here. For simplicity, we state them all as decision problems; corresponding optimization versions can be obtained by asking to optimize some objective function over the set of feasible solutions (in particular, e.g., minimizing some approximate error). To that end, in the following, let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be either a *curve segment* (an arbitrary curve segment between two distinct points in the plane that does not cross itself) or a *shape contour* (an arbitrary closed curve in the plane that encloses precisely one nonempty connected area). For a point $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$, some nonnegativedefinite distance measure $\rho : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}_+$ (e.g., the Euclidean ℓ_2 -norm difference) and some $\delta \geq 0$, let $\mathcal{N}^{\rho}_{\delta}(p) \coloneqq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \rho(x, p) \leq \delta\}$ denote the ρ -ball of radius δ around p.

For a given \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{F} , the outcomes we are interested in are always simple paths or cycles¹ constructed from components of \mathcal{G} that (more or less closely) "follow" all of \mathcal{F} . (One may think of "following" here as nowhere deviating from \mathcal{F} by more than some constant distance, i.e., being contained in a "corridor" $C_{\varepsilon}^{\sigma}(\mathcal{F}) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \sigma(x, y) \leq \varepsilon \ \forall y \in \mathcal{F}\} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x \in \mathcal{N}_{\varepsilon}^{\sigma}(y) \text{ for some } y \in \mathcal{F}\}$ for some distance measure σ and constant $\varepsilon \geq 0$; in case of shape contours, such a corridor should resemble a "2D torus", i.e., still have a "hole".) For clarity, we shall thus call such paths and cycles \mathcal{F} -resembling \mathcal{G} -paths/cycles, respectively. (Also, recall that such paths/cycles are valid only if they are "planar", i.e., without selfintersections, and obey possible edge-type budgets.)

Our main (decision) problem of interest can be formally stated as follows:

DISCRETE CONTOUR APPROXIMATION WITH SAMPLING (DCA-S): Given a shape contour $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, sample points $\{p_1, \ldots, p_k\}$ on \mathcal{F} , a DAS $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D})$, a distance measure $\rho : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}_+$ and a parameter $\delta \geq 0$, does there exist a valid \mathcal{F} -resembling \mathcal{G} -cycle with at least one node in each $\mathcal{N}^{\rho}_{\delta}(p_i)$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$?

Our computational method (cf. Section 3) will be based on the DCA-S problem. Moreover, the following variant asking for a \mathcal{G} -path approximating a curve segment between two distinct points is both of separate interest and will resurface as a subproblem (in a certain sense) in our algorithm.

DISCRETE PATH APPROXIMATION WITH SAMPLING (DPA-S): Given a curve segment $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ between two points $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, a DAS $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D})$, sample points $\{p_1, \ldots, p_k\}$ on \mathcal{F} , a distance measure

¹Here, we appropriate some terminology from graph theory, but note that, while structurally similar to (planar) graphs, concrete \mathcal{G} -constructions are essentially *defined* via their embedding in the plane, whereas graphs are more abstract objects that may or may not have planar embeddings.

 $\rho : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}_+$ and a parameter $\delta \ge 0$, does there exist a valid \mathcal{F} -resembling \mathcal{G} -path connecting x_1 and x_2 (either exactly or approximately by placing nodes in $\mathcal{N}^{\rho}_{\delta}(x_1)$ and $\mathcal{N}^{\rho}_{\delta}(x_2)$) with at least one node in each $\mathcal{N}^{\rho}_{\delta}(p_i), i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$?

In fact, the feasibility of *freely* connecting two distinct points in \mathbb{R}^2 (without regard to any curve segment resemblance objectives, sample points or corridor containment) using components of a DAS is still of interest as an intuitively simpler-seeming, very basic problem:

DISCRETE POINT CONNECTIVITY (DPC): Given two points $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and a DAS \mathcal{G} , can x_1 and x_2 be connected by a valid \mathcal{G} -path?

2.2 Intractability Results

We now turn to the computational complexity of the fundamental DAS shape approximation problems defined above. Our intractability results will be based on the following two problems, which are well-known to be NP-complete (see [5, problems SP12 and SP15]):

PARTITION: Given positive integers a_1, \ldots, a_n , does there exist a subset I' of $I \coloneqq [n] \coloneqq \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $\sum_{i \in I'} a_i = \sum_{i \in I \setminus I'} a_i$?

3-PARTITION: Given positive integers a_1, \ldots, a_{3m} and A such that $A/4 < a_i < A/2$ for all $i \in I := [3m]$ and $\sum_{i \in I} a_i = mA$, can I be partitioned into m disjoint (3-element) sets I_1, \ldots, I_m such that, for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}, \sum_{i \in I_j} a_j = A$?

Our first result is about DPA-S; the subsequent ones about the other problems are derived along the same lines, with slight variations of the same main proof idea.

Theorem 2.1. The DPA-S problem is NP-hard in the strong sense, even restricted to piecewise linear curve segments \mathcal{F} with right-angle turns and integral-coordinate turning points and end points (x_1, x_2) , integral-coordinate sample points, square $(\ell_{\infty}$ -norm) boxes as sample point neighborhoods $\mathcal{N}^{\rho}_{\delta}(\cdot)$, and DASs \mathcal{G} with only one node type, horizontal and vertical orientations, and integral-length edge types.

Proof. We reduce from 3-PARTITION: Let (a_1, \ldots, a_{3m}, A) be a given 3-PARTITION instance; we may and do assume that A is polynomially bounded my m, since [5] proved that 3-PARTITION remains NP-complete under these restrictions and is thus, in fact, NP-complete *in the strong sense*². We construct an instance of DCA-S with restrictions as specified in the theorem statement: Let k be the number of *distinct* a_i values in the given 3-PARTITION instance and associate with each such value (say, a'_{ℓ}) an edge type e_{ℓ} with length a'_{ℓ} ; set $\mathcal{E} := \{e_{\ell} : \ell = 1, \ldots, k\}$ and define the budgets $\mathcal{B} := \{b_e : e \in \mathcal{E}\}$ with $b_{e_{\ell}} :=$ $|\{i \in [3m] : a_i = a'_{\ell}\}|$. Further, let $\mathcal{V} := \{v\}$ (the single node type), and let \mathcal{D} be given via the horizontal and vertical direction vectors, all of which are defined to be compatible with each node and edge type, i.e., $\mathcal{D} := \{(d, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}) : d \in \{\pm(1, 0), \pm(0, 1)\}\}$. This completes the (obviously polynomial) construction of the DAS $\mathcal{G} := (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D})$. To specify the curve segment, sample points and their neighborhoods, let $0 \leq \delta < A/4$ (say, $\delta := A/9$), $\rho(x, y) := ||x - y||_{\infty}$, and define points $p_j := (\lfloor j/2 \rfloor A, (\lceil j/2 \rceil \mod 2)A)$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, m$. Set $x_1 := p_0, x_2 := p_m$ and define \mathcal{F} to be the chain of piecewise linear segments connecting p_j with p_{j+1} for all $j = 0, \ldots, m-1$ (i.e., $\mathcal{F} := \bigcup_{i \in [m]} \{\lambda p_{i-1} + (1 - \lambda)p_i : \lambda \in [0, 1]\}$), see Figure 2 for a visualization. Clearly, by means of p_j , ρ and δ , both \mathcal{F} and each $\mathcal{N}^{\rho}_{\delta}(p_i)$ can be encoded with size polynomial in that of the given 3-PARTITION instance, and containment in either can be evaluated in polynomial time.

Thus, the overall construction is indeed polynomial, so it remains to show that the given 3-PARTITION instance has a positive answer if and only if the constructed DPA-S instance does as well:

- "⇒": If (a_1, \ldots, a_{3m}, A) is a "yes"-instance of 3-PARTITION with certificate (I_1, \ldots, I_m) , a corresponding solution to the DPA-S instance is given by the valid \mathcal{F} -resembling \mathcal{G} -path that connects x_1 and x_2 by using (exactly) three edges to reach each respective next (right-angle) turn, thus mapping I_1, \ldots, I_m to the *m* path segments of length *A*. Clearly, all direction constraints are obeyed, the budgets are sufficient (in fact, depleted with no left-overs) and the \mathcal{G} -path precisely overlays \mathcal{F} (thus placing DASnodes at each turning/sample point, so each $\mathcal{N}^{\rho}_{\delta}(p_i)$ indeed contains a node). Thus, this solution shows that the DPA-S instance has a "yes" answer.
- " \Leftarrow ": Conversely, let a "yes"-certificate of the DPA-S instance be given, and let e_1, \ldots, e_M be the sequence of edge types used along the \mathcal{G} -path from x_1 to x_2 . Since $\delta < A/4 < \min a'_i$ and $\max a'_i < A/2$, exactly three edges of the same orientation must be used in each path-segment. Moreover, the lengths of all these three-edge subsets must sum to A, because otherwise, a neighborhood ($\mathcal{N}^{\rho}_{\delta}(p_i)$ -) containment

²Recall that this means that, unless P=NP, not only does there not exist a polynomial algorithm to decide the problem, but also no pseudo-polynomial algorithm (and, for strongly NP-hard *optimization* problems, no fully polynomial-time approximation scheme (FPTAS)). We refer to [5] for details.



Figure 2: Schematic illustration of the construction from the proof of Theorem 2.1: The neighborhoods $\mathcal{N}_{\delta}^{\rho}(p_i)$ (shaded boxes) contain all points with ℓ_{∞} -norm distance at most δ from the associated sample points p_i (black dots), respectively. The piecewise linear x_1 - x_2 -path \mathcal{F} is the solid curve (with turns at p_1, \ldots, p_{m-1}); all m segments of this path have length A. The dashed and lighter-shaded parts of \mathcal{F} and some $\mathcal{N}_{\delta}^{\rho}(p_i)$, respectively, illustrate a continuation of the discernible pattern in accordance with the actual instance size.

condition would be violated either immediately or after the next turn. This shows that M = 3m, and that we can construct a "yes"-certificate I_1, \ldots, I_m for the input 3-PARTITION instance by traversing e_1, \ldots, e_{3m} and mapping the encountered three-tuples $E_j := (e_{3j-2}, e_{3j-1}, e_{3j}), j = 1, \ldots, m$, to $I_j := \{j_1, j_2, j_3\}$ with $j_1 := \min\{i : a_i = a'_{3j-2}, i \notin I_k \forall k < j\}, j_2 := \min\{i : a_i = a'_{3j-1}, i \notin I_k \forall k < j, i \neq j_1\}$, and $j_3 := \min\{i : a_i = a'_{3j}, i \notin I_k \forall k < j, i \neq j_1, i \neq j_2\}$, respectively.

This proves NP-hardness of the DPA-S problem. Moreover, in particular, for the DPA-S instance constructed from the 3-PARTITION input with the stated restrictions, all encoding lengths as well as the occurring numbers themselves are polynomially bounded by the instance *size* (number of specified integers, $\mathcal{O}(m)$) alone. Therefore, the "strong sense" assertion of NP-hardness carries over to DPA-S as well.

Finally, note that the above proof goes through completely analogously if we require DAS nodes exactly at x_1 and x_2 , so both variants from the DPA-S definition are covered.

It is easily seen that the proof of Theorem 2.1 goes through completely analogously for DPA-S variants requiring the \mathcal{G} -path to be contained in a corridor $C^{\sigma}_{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{F})$ and/or minimizing a (nonnegative) error measure w.r.t. \mathcal{F} . Thus, we immediately obtain the following.

Corollary 2.2. The DPA-S problem remains NP-hard in the strong sense (under the same restrictions as listed in Theorem 2.1) if the \mathcal{F} -resembling \mathcal{G} -path P is required to lie within a corridor $C^{\sigma}_{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{F})$ around \mathcal{F} and/or the objective of minimizing an approximation error $\alpha(P, \mathcal{F}) \geq 0$ is included. In the latter case, hardness persists even if no sample point neighborhood (and/or corridor) containment is required.

Proof. We can directly extend the reduction from the proof of Theorem 2.1 by letting (for instance) $C^{\sigma}_{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{F}) := \{x : \|x - y\|_{\infty} \leq \delta \ \forall y \in \mathcal{F}\}$ and observing that any nonnegative definite error measure (e.g., the area between \mathcal{F} and the \mathcal{G} -path P) achieves minimum value $\alpha(P, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ if and only if P exactly matches \mathcal{F} . \Box

Remark 2.3. It is not immediately clear whether the DPA-S decision problem is contained in NP. For this to hold, we would need to assert that a "yes"-certificate for an (arbitrary) DPA-S instance has encoding length polynomially bounded by that of the instance, and that all constraints can be verified in polynomial time. Allowing only rational input data (in particular, edge lengths and point coordinates) and suitably "simple" definitions of \mathcal{F} and $\mathcal{N}^{\rho}_{\delta}(p_i)$ (and $C^{\sigma}_{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{F})$ and/or $\alpha(P, \mathcal{F})$, in the variants from Corollary 2.2), containment in NP may appear to be easy to demonstrate. For the variant that places DAS nodes exactly at $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{Q}^2$, restricting to piecewise linear \mathcal{F} with rational turn points and neighborhoods based on, say, ℓ_1 - or ℓ_{∞} -norm differences (such as used in the reduction above), containment in NP is indeed obtained straightforwardly, making the problem NP-complete (in the strong sense). However, allowing the end nodes of the \mathcal{G} -path to deviate from x_1 and x_2 , respectively, a certificate might be a valid \mathcal{F} -resembling \mathcal{G} -cycle that involves node coordinates of non-polynomial encoding length (e.g., irrational values), so containment in NP cannot be proven in general. Analogous arguments hold for the other problems discussed below (DCA-S, DPC) as well; for brevity, we mention this only once here.

The above results extend straightforwardly to the DCA-S problem (and corresponding variants):

Theorem 2.4. The DCA-S problem is NP-hard in the strong sense, even restricted to piecewise linear curve segments \mathcal{F} with right-angle turns and integral-coordinate turning and sample points, square $(\ell_{\infty}\text{-norm})$ boxes as sample point neighborhoods $\mathcal{N}^{\rho}_{\delta}(\cdot)$, and DASs \mathcal{G} with only one node type, horizontal and vertical orientations, and integral-length edge types.



Figure 3: Schematic illustration of the construction from the proof of Theorem 2.4 (and Corollary 2.6) in the cases m and $\lceil m/2 \rceil$ even (top left), m even and $\lceil m/2 \rceil$ odd (top right), or m odd (bottom): The corridor $C_{\delta}^{\rho}(\mathcal{F})$ (shaded region) contains all points with ℓ_{∞} -norm distance at most δ from the piecewise linear shape contour \mathcal{F} (solid curve). All m segments of the path $p_0-p_1-\cdots-p_m$ have length A; the corridor is 2δ wide. The dashed and lighter-shaded parts of \mathcal{F} and $C_{\delta}^{\rho}(\mathcal{F})$, respectively, illustrate a continuation of the discernible pattern (or of long auxiliary segments) in accordance with the actual instance size.

Proof. We modify the reduction used to show NP-hardness of the DPA-S problem, so at first, let \mathcal{V} , \mathcal{E} , \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{B} as well as k, ρ, δ and p_0, \ldots, p_m be constructed from a given 3-PARTITION instance as in the proof of Theorem 2.1. Depending on whether m and $\lceil m/2 \rceil$ are even or odd, we construct further points (in order to specify \mathcal{F} and to choose as sample points) and add edge types as follows:

- If m is odd (so $\lceil m/2 \rceil$ is always even and $p_m = (\lfloor m/2 \rfloor A, 0), p_{m-1} = (\lfloor (m-1)/2 \rfloor A, A) = (\lfloor m/2 \rfloor A, A)),$ define $p_{m+1} \coloneqq ((\lfloor m/2 \rfloor + 2)A, 0), p_{m+2} \coloneqq ((\lfloor m/2 \rfloor + 2)A, -2A), p_{m+3} \coloneqq (-2A, -2A)$ and $p_{m+4} \coloneqq (-2A, 0)$, and add edge type e_{k+1} with length $(\lfloor m/2 \rfloor + 4)A$, budget $b_{e_{k+1}} = 1$ and compatible directions $\pm (1, 0)$, as well as edge type e_{k+2} with length 2A, budget $b_{e_{k+2}} = 4$ and compatible directions $\{\pm (0, 1), \pm (1, 0)\}.$
- If both m and $\lceil m/2 \rceil$ are even (so $\lceil m/2 \rceil = m/2 = \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$, $p_m = ((m/2)A, 0)$ and $p_{m-1} = (\lfloor (m-1)/2 \rfloor A, (\lceil (m-1)/2 \rceil \mod 2)A) = ((m/2-1)A, 0))$, define $p_{m+1} \coloneqq (\lfloor m/2 \rfloor A, -2A)$, $p_{m+2} \coloneqq (-2A, -2A)$ and $p_{m+3} \coloneqq (-2A, 0)$, and add edge type e_{k+1} with length $(\lfloor m/2 \rfloor + 2)A$, budget $b_{e_{k+1}} = 1$ and compatible directions $\pm (1, 0)$, as well as edge type e_{k+2} with length 2A, budget $b_{e_{k+2}} = 3$ and compatible directions $\{\pm (0, 1), \pm (1, 0)\}$.
- In the final case, m is even and $\lceil m/2 \rceil = m/2 = \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$ is odd (so $p_m = ((m/2)A, A)$ and $p_{m-1} = ((m/2-1)A, A)$); then, we define $p_{m+1} := (\lfloor m/2 \rfloor A, -2A)$, $p_{m+2} := (-2A, -2A)$ and $p_{m+3} := (-2A, 0)$, and add edge type e_{k+1} with length $(\lfloor m/2 \rfloor + 2)A$, budget $b_{e_{k+1}} = 1$ and compatible directions $\pm (1, 0)$, as well as edge types e_{k+2} and e_{k+3} with lengths 3A and 2A, budgets $b_{e_{k+2}} = 1$ and $b_{e_{k+3}} = 2$ and compatible directions $\pm (0, 1)$ and $\{\pm (0, 1), \pm (1, 0)\}$, respectively.

Finally, define the shape contour \mathcal{F} as the piecewise-linear cycle $p_0 \to p_1 \to \cdots \to p_{m+3} (\to p_{m+4}) \to p_0$. Figure 3 illustrates the construction for the three cases (for the DCA-S variant with a feasible corridor of ℓ_{∞} -width δ).

It is now easily seen, analogously to the proof of Theorem 2.1, that a solution to a "yes"-instance of 3-PARTITION is in one-to-one correspondence with (the core part of) that of a "yes"-instance of the constructed DCA-S instance (in any case); in particular, the additional edge types serve simply to "close the loop" and cannot be used in any other parts of the \mathcal{G} -cycle (note that, since $\delta < A/4$, $\lfloor m/2 \rfloor A \ge 3A > 2A > A + 2\delta$, so even the shortest new edge does not fit anywhere else except in the accordingly designed new segments). Thus, the previously crucial problem of connecting p_0 and p_m by a valid \mathcal{G} -path is subsumed by that of finding a valid \mathcal{F} -resembling \mathcal{G} -cycle here. (Unlike in the fixed end-point variant of DPA-S, here, a feasible DCA-S solution never needs to overlay \mathcal{F} exactly, but due to the choice of δ , there still can be only exactly three edges of type e_{ℓ} , $\ell \in [k]$, per segment of the shape contour subpath from p_0 to p_m .) Furthermore, since the previous construction was only modified by adding a constant number of new polynomially-bounded elements but is otherwise completely analogous, it can be carried out in polynomial time with all occurring numbers and their encoding lengths being polynomially bounded by the instance size (i.e., polynomial in m). Thus, the above extended reduction proves NP-hardness in the strong sense of the DCA-S problem.

Remark 2.5. In the above proof of Theorem 2.4, the budget constraints for auxiliary edges added to the original construction are not essential and could just as well be omitted (i.e., using infinite budgets).

Analogously to the corresponding results for DPA-S, we immediately also obtain intractability of the DCA-S variants involving a feasible corridor (cf. Figure 3) and/or approximation error minimization:

Corollary 2.6. The DCA-S problem is NP-hard in the strong sense (under the same restrictions as listed in Theorem 2.4) if the \mathcal{F} -resembling \mathcal{G} -cycle C is required to lie within a corridor $C^{\sigma}_{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{F})$ around \mathcal{F} and/or the objective of minimizing an approximation error $\alpha(C, \mathcal{F}) \geq 0$ is included. In the latter case, hardness persists even if no sample point neighborhood (and/or corridor) containment is required.

Proof. We can extend the proof of Theorem 2.4 along the same lines as in that of Corollary 2.2.

A more basic problem simply asks whether a given DAS allows to connect two given points in the plane, without asking for any resemblance to some curve segment or shape contour. This is precisely the DPC problem defined earlier; as it turns out, even this fundamental problem is already (weakly) NP-hard.

Theorem 2.7. The DPC problem is NP-hard, even if restricting the DAS to one node type, horizontal and vertical orientations, and integral-length edge types. For rational input, DPC is contained in NP (and thus NP-complete).

Proof. We now reduce from PARTITION, which is a weakly NP-hard problem [5]. Given an instance (a_1, \ldots, a_n) of PARTITION, let $A := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i$ and construct an instance of DPC as follows (along the same lines as in the previous proof for DPA-S): Let k be the number of distinct a_i -values and associate with each such value (say, a'_{ℓ}) an edge type e_{ℓ} with length a'_{ℓ} to obtain $\mathcal{E} := \{e_{\ell} : \ell = 1, \ldots, k\}$ and budgets $\mathcal{B} := \{b_e : e \in \mathcal{E}\}$, where $b_{e_{\ell}} := |\{i \in [3m] : a_i = a'_{\ell}\}|$. We again use a single node type $\mathcal{V} := \{v\}$ and let $\mathcal{D} := \{(d, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}) : d \in \{\pm(1, 0), \pm(0, 1)\}\}$, i.e., the horizontal and vertical directions are to be compatible with each node and edge type. This defines the DAS $\mathcal{G} := (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D})$. Finally, we set $x_1 := (0, 0)$ and $x_2 := (A, A)$. Clearly this construction can be carried out in polynomial time and space.

It remains to demonstrate that the given PARTITION instance has a "yes"-answer if and only if the constructed DPC instance does. To that end, note that there is a one-to-one correspondence between a partition $I', [n] \setminus I'$ such that $\sum_{i \in I'} a_i = \sum_{i \notin I} a_i (= A)$ and the edges with horizontal or vertical orientation, respectively: To connect x_1 and x_2 , we need to "go" A in both directions, which is possible if and only if the total of n edges can be partitioned into vertical and horizontal edges with respective length sums A.

While this shows NP-hardness of DPC, when restricting to rational input (coordinates, orientations and edge lengths), containment in NP is obvious, proving the second claim and thus completing the proof. \Box

The above result has several consequences that may be of further, separate interest:

Corollary 2.8. Given a DAS \mathcal{G} and two points $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, it is NP-hard to find a shortest valid \mathcal{G} -path connecting x_1 and x_2 , i.e., one with the smallest number of edges.

Proof. The proof of Theorem 2.7 can be directly adapted to the corresponding decision problem "Given \mathcal{G} , x_1, x_2 and a positive integer k, can x_1 and x_2 be connected by a valid \mathcal{G} -path using at most k edges?", by letting $k \coloneqq n$ (the number of elements of the original input PARTITION instance).

Furthermore, we could reintroduce a curve segment and sample points (and/or a feasible corridor) into the DPC problem and the proof of Theorem 2.7, thereby obtaining another proof of NP-hardness for the DPA-S problem. Although Theorem 2.1 gives a stronger result than a reduction from PARTITION, this alternative proof shows that the DPA-S problem and its variants (from Corollary 2.2) still remain (weakly) NP-hard even if the curve segment to be approximated is piecewise linear with a single right-angle turn. Moreover, similarly extending the construction along the same lines as in the proof of Theorem 2.4, we also obtain that the DCA-S variants remain (weakly) NP-hard even when restricted to simple square shapes. We omit the straightforward details of the constructions, which mirror that in the previous proofs (cf. Figures 2 and 3, in particular).

In the remainder of the paper, we will demonstrate that in spite of the theoretical intractability, good solutions to the DAS shape contour approximation problems can be obtained in practice within reasonable time. For simplicity, we will mostly restrict our discussion to the contour approximation problem (DCA-S) an omit an explicit treatment of the curve segment approximation task (DPA-S). Indeed, it is straightforward to adapt the developed approaches and methods to the DPA-S problem.

3 Methodology & Algorithm

Computing a "best" \mathcal{F} -resembling \mathcal{G} -cycle (w.r.t. some quality measure) is clearly a non-trivial task posing many challenges, as outlined in the introduction. Aside from the theoretical intractability of even deciding feasibility established in the previous section, evaluating error measures is generally not possible without knowing \mathcal{G} and therefore hard to directly incorporate into an optimization scheme. Naive exhaustive search approaches would essentially need access to all possible \mathcal{G} -structures that may be conceivable to approximately represent \mathcal{F} , which is of course prohibitive given the considerable combinatorial explosion that can be expected in general; for instance, if \mathcal{G} is the (most versatile 2D) standard Zometool system, each Zometool node can, in principle, lead to (up to) 36 distinct other nodes, each of which again has 36 possible neighbors (though not all can exist simultaneously, all possible combinations are generally viable), and so forth.

For very restrictive DASs, simple solutions may be possible. For instance, if only two orientations (four directions; say, horizontal and vertical with 90°-degree angles in between) and only one edge/strut type (length) are allowed, for any fixed global positioning (and rotation), \mathcal{G} induces a grid-graph-like structure. Then, the DCA task reduces to finding an \mathcal{F} -resembling cycle in such a grid, along with the global positioning (and, possibly, rotation) of this grid in \mathbb{R}^2 . In a fixed such grid, solutions could be obtained, e.g., in a greedy fashion or by shortest-path-based schemes (shortest-cycle methods are not directly applicable because we need to ensure \mathcal{F} -resemblance, but might be extendable by incorporating sample point neighborhoods as in DCA-S), with edge/strut weights derived from some measures to evaluate distance to \mathcal{F} . Including a global grid shift in the optimization to find the best match to \mathcal{F} may still be problematic in this context. Nevertheless, once the grid has been anchored (at an arbitrary point), heuristic or even locally optimal solutions (w.r.t. the omitted positioning optimization) could be obtained quickly and might serve as initial solutions to more sophisticated methods for DCA tasks over more general DASs that contain the considered grid structure as a sub-DAS.

In the general setting, however, graph-based methods are inadequate since it is not known (or infeasible to set up) a priori where possible struts may be located, and location is crucial for assigning weights that reflect closeness to \mathcal{F} . We therefore propose a three-phase approach that first obtains a set of sample points along \mathcal{F} , then solves a mixed-integer program (MIP) to obtain a solution to a DCA-S problem with minimal number of struts, and finally explores the possible arrangements of the selected struts in order to find the best approximation to \mathcal{F} that can be constructed using them. Focussing on \mathcal{G} -paths (between regions around the sample points) with small number of struts avoids the problem of inaccessibility of suitable placement-dependent strut/path-quality measures on the one hand, and on the other hand, quite intuitively implements the fact that desirable solutions will not stray too far from \mathcal{F} (or contain odd zigzagging parts) and hence necessarily have relatively few struts. It also makes edge-crossings/overlaps less likely (although we do not explicitly enforce this planarity of the sought \mathcal{G} -paths or cycles; it turned out to be almost always automatically fulfilled in our experiments, and can easily be remedied in postprocessing in practice). Once the number of struts is known (for each segment of the \mathcal{G} -cycle to be computed), we can exploit the fact that struts in a \mathcal{G} -path can be arbitrarily permuted without disconnecting the end points, and simply enumerate all such permutations and evaluate a quality function w.r.t. the approximation error to \mathcal{F} for each one in order to identify the best arrangement using the computed strut collection. (Should full enumeration become too expensive, which may happen if a segment contains many struts, one may also resort to a greedy construction that determines a permutation by sequentially picking locally optimal struts.)

In the remainder of this section, we will first introduce mixed-integer programming (MIP) formulations for some of the DAS shape approximation problems, and then describe in detail the overall algorithm to compute \mathcal{F} -resembling \mathcal{G} -cycles of high quality. In order to avoid repetitions when turning to computational experiments later, we directly discuss the MIPs and algorithms in the context of *Zometool* shape approximation; thus, \mathcal{G} will henceforth always refer to the (standard) Zometool system described in the introduction (see Section 1.2). This concretization notwithstanding, we emphasize that all ingredients straightforwardly generalize to arbitrary other DASs.

3.1 MIP Formulations

Recall from the introduction that, assuming a Zometool node is placed at the origin (0,0) and that the shortest blue strut length is scaled to $b_0 = 2$, every point reachable by Zometool components has coordinates of the form $(\alpha_1 + \phi\beta_1, \alpha_2 + \phi\beta_2)$ with $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for i = 1, 2. For every different strut in the Zometool system, there are four admissible directions, cf. Figure 1, where two of them are the respective opposites of the other two. Thus, for each strut color $e \in \{b, r, y\}$ (blue, red, yellow) and length $i \in \{s, m, \ell\}$ (short,

medium, long), we may collect the corresponding translation vectors as columns of the following matrices:

$$\begin{split} M_s^b &= \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad M_m^b = \begin{pmatrix} 2\phi & 0 \\ 0 & 2\phi \end{pmatrix}, \qquad M_\ell^b = \begin{pmatrix} 2+2\phi & 0 \\ 0 & 2+2\phi \end{pmatrix}, \\ M_s^r &= \begin{pmatrix} \phi & \phi \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad M_m^r = \begin{pmatrix} 1+\phi & 1+\phi \\ -\phi & \phi \end{pmatrix}, \qquad M_\ell^r = \begin{pmatrix} 1+2\phi & 1+2\phi \\ -1-\phi & 1+\phi \end{pmatrix}, \\ M_s^y &= \begin{pmatrix} -1+\phi & -1+\phi \\ -\phi & \phi \end{pmatrix}, \qquad M_m^y = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1-\phi & 1+\phi \end{pmatrix}, \qquad M_\ell^y = \begin{pmatrix} \phi & \phi \\ -1-2\phi & 1+2\phi \end{pmatrix}. \end{split}$$

For example, starting at a node (x, y), taking a "step" along a strut e of length i in positive or negative/opposite direction of, say, the second orientation thus leads to target node coordinates $(x + (M_i^e)_{12}, y + (M_i^e)_{22})$ or $(x - (M_i^e)_{12}, y - (M_i^e)_{22})$, respectively.

3.1.1 Connecting Points by Zome-Paths

Now, let us first consider the (Zome-)DPC problem: Can we connect two given points $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ by a \mathcal{G} -path? This question can be answered by solving the following integer feasibility problem (IFP):

find
$$\gamma_{e,i}^+, \gamma_{e,i}^- \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2 \quad \forall e \in \{b, r, y\}, i \in \{s, m, \ell\}$$
 (1)
s.t. $x_2 = x_1 + \sum_{e \in \{b, r, y\}} \sum_{i \in \{s, m, \ell\}} M_i^e \left(\gamma_{e,i}^+ - \gamma_{e,i}^-\right)$
 $\left((\gamma_{e,i}^+)_j \cdot (\gamma_{e,i}^-)_j = 0 \quad \forall e \in \{b, r, y\}, i \in \{s, m, \ell\}, j \in \{1, 2\}\right)$

Here, for each $e \in \{b, r, y\}$ and $i \in \{s, m, \ell\}$, the variables $(\gamma_{e,i}^+)_j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $(\gamma_{e,i}^-)_j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ specify the number of times the *j*-th corresponding strut (i.e., the *j*-th column vector of matrix M_i^e) is used in positive direction (directly as given in M_i^e , superscript "+") or in negative direction (superscript "-"), respectively. The equality constraint models the desired connectivity by expressing point x_2 as x_1 plus an integer linear combination of the available struts. Thus, the DPC question can be answered in the affirmative if and only if a feasible variable assignment for the above IFP can be found. The last, optional complementarity constraint may be used to exclude paths that contain segments of same-color same-length struts being used in opposite directions (which merely shift the Zome-path part in between in the plane but serve no further purpose regarding endpoint connectivity). To avoid nonlinearity, it could also be formulated as a special ordered set type 1 (SOS-1) constraint³, or be omitted entirely for suitable objective functions. Moreover, note that we could assume w.l.o.g. that $x_1 = (0,0)$ (otherwise, simply subtract x_1 from x_1 and x_2) and then may also check a priori whether x_2 even has Zometool coordinates, i.e., whether $x_2 = (\alpha_1 + \phi \beta_1, \alpha_2 + \phi \beta_2)$ with some $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for i = 1, 2.

The above feasibility problem may become numerically instable because of the explicit occurrence of the golden ratio ϕ (in all but one M_i^e). However, we can make use of the special form of Zometool coordinates and, by lifting the problem into 4-dimensional space, obtain an equivalent IFP that only contains small integral coefficients. To that end, let $\hat{x} := (\alpha_1^x, \beta_1^x, \alpha_2^x, \beta_2^x) \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ be the integer representation of a point x with Zometool coordinates $x = (\alpha_1^x + \beta_1^x \phi, \alpha_2^x + \beta_2^x \phi)$. Analogously, let \hat{M}_i^e be the 4×2 matrix obtained from M_i^e by replacing its columns with the respective integer representations of the corresponding Zometool coordinate vectors. Now, we can reformulate the DPC integer feasibility problem, where w.l.o.g. $x_1 = (0, 0)$, as:

find
$$\gamma_{e,i}^+, \gamma_{e,i}^- \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2 \quad \forall e \in \{b, r, y\}, i \in \{s, m, \ell\}$$
 (2)
s.t.
$$\sum_{e \in \{b, r, y\}} \sum_{i \in \{s, m, \ell\}} \hat{M}_i^e \left(\gamma_{e,i}^+ - \gamma_{e,i}^-\right) = \hat{x}_2$$

$$\left((\gamma_{e,i}^+)_j \cdot (\gamma_{e,i}^-)_j = 0 \quad \forall e \in \{b, r, y\}, i \in \{s, m, \ell\}, j \in \{1, 2\} \right)$$

Note that $|(\hat{M}_i^e)_{j,k}| \in \{0,1,2\}$ for all $e \in \{b,r,y\}$ and $i \in \{s,m,\ell\}$ $(j \in \{1,2,3,4\}, k \in \{1,2\})$.

Based on this integer formulation of Zome connectivity, we can, in particular, formulate the DPC variant that asks for a shortest Zome-path, i.e., one that requires the smallest number of struts to connect the given

³ SOS-1($\gamma_{e,i}^+, \gamma_{e,i}^-$) constraints enforce that only one of $\gamma_{e,i}^+, \gamma_{e,i}^-$ may be nonzero; they can be realized, e.g., by introducing auxiliary binary variables $z_{e,i}^{\pm}$ and linear constraints $\gamma_{e,i}^{\pm} \leq \mathcal{M} z_{e,i}^{\pm}$ and $z_{e,i}^+ + z_{e,i}^- \leq 1$, where \mathcal{M} is a sufficiently large constant (here, the respective strut budget sizes suffice, if available). Modern MIP solvers can handle SOS-1 constraints efficiently.

input points:

$$\min \sum_{e \in \{b,r,y\}} \sum_{i \in \{s,m,\ell\}} \sum_{j=1}^{2} (\gamma_{e,i}^{+})_{j} + (\gamma_{e,i}^{-})_{j}$$
(3)
s.t.
$$\sum_{e \in \{b,r,y\}} \sum_{i \in \{s,m,\ell\}} \hat{M}_{i}^{e} \left(\gamma_{e,i}^{+} - \gamma_{e,i}^{-}\right) = \hat{x}_{2}$$
$$\gamma_{e,i}^{+}, \gamma_{e,i}^{-} \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{2} \quad \forall e \in \{b,r,y\}, i \in \{s,m,\ell\}$$

As alluded to earlier, here, minimizing the sum of all variables (a linear function) will automatically induce the complementarity conditions $(\gamma_{e,i}^+)_j \cdot (\gamma_{e,i}^-)_j = 0$, which are therefore omitted.

Finally, note that strut budget restrictions can be straightforwardly integrated into all of the above models by adding constraints of the form

$$\mathbb{1}^{\top} \gamma_{e,i}^{+} + \mathbb{1}^{\top} \gamma_{e,i}^{-} = \sum_{j=1}^{2} (\gamma_{e,i}^{+})_{j} + (\gamma_{e,i}^{-})_{j} \le B_{i}^{e},$$
(4)

where $B_i^e \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ is the maximal allowed number of struts of color e and length i (and 1 is the all-ones vector).

3.1.2 Zome-Cycles Resembling a Shape Contour

Let us now turn to the problem of approximating a shape contour by a Zometool cycle. We handle the nontrivial task of \mathcal{F} -resemblance by requiring our \mathcal{G} -cycle to pass through the respective neighborhoods of predefined sample points along \mathcal{F} , i.e., we consider the DCA-S problem. Concrete options for choosing the sample points will be discussed in the next section; for now, assume they are already given.

Again, we focus on the objective of finding such a \mathcal{G} -cycle that consists of as few struts as possible (per segment between nodes placed in sample point neighborhoods). As mentioned before, this property can generally be seen as a loose proxy to the ultimate goal of minimizing some measure of deviation from the actual shape contour, since a good \mathcal{G} -cycle w.r.t. the latter will neither contain undesirable detours nor zigzagging segments, both of which are also intuitively avoided by few-strut \mathcal{G} -cycles.

Moreover, the basic idea for our MIP model for DCA-S builds on the DPC-IP (3): We desire (at least) one Zometool node to lie in the vicinity of each sample point (i.e., in the corresponding $\mathcal{N}_{\delta}^{\rho}(p_i)$), and require each such Zometool node to be connected by a \mathcal{G} -path to the Zometool node in the next sample point neighborhood encountered when moving along \mathcal{F} in a fixed "direction" (clockwise or counter-clockwise). To that end, we can employ point connectivity constraints similar to those employed in the IP models discussed in Section 3.1.1. Additionally, we label the variables that determine the numbers of struts to be used by segment, and introduce new variables that pertain to the Zometool nodes to be put into each sample point neighborhood. Finally, by using two continuous coordinate variables $(g \in \mathbb{R}^2)$, we can model the global shift of the Zometool construction, so that the first Zometool node can be interpreted w.l.o.g. to lie at the origin (0, 0). This shift is then used to constrain the Zometool nodes at the end of each \mathcal{G} -path (\mathcal{G} -cycle segment) to lie in the predefined sample point neighborhoods $\mathcal{N}_{\delta}^{\rho}(p_i)$, which we define as ℓ_{∞} -norm boxes of uniform width $\delta \geq 0$ around each respective sample point. Putting this all together yields the following MIP (with optional budget and SOS-1 constraints), where $p_1, \ldots, p_k \in \mathbb{R}^2$ are the given sample points on \mathcal{F} :

$$\min \sum_{\kappa=1}^{k} \sum_{e \in \{b,r,y\}} \sum_{i \in \{s,m,\ell\}} \sum_{j=1}^{2} (\gamma_{e,i}^{\kappa,+})_{j} + (\gamma_{e,i}^{\kappa,-})_{j}$$
(5)
s.t. $\hat{x}_{1} = (0,0,0,0)$
 $-\delta \mathbb{1} \leq ((\hat{x}_{\kappa})_{1} + (\hat{x}_{\kappa})_{2}\phi, (\hat{x}_{\kappa})_{3} + (\hat{x}_{\kappa})_{4}\phi) + g - p_{\kappa} \leq \delta \mathbb{1} \quad \forall \kappa \in \{1,\dots,k\}$
 $\hat{x}_{(\kappa \mod k)+1} = \hat{x}_{\kappa} + \sum_{e \in \{b,r,y\}} \sum_{i \in \{s,m,\ell\}} \hat{M}_{i}^{e} \left(\gamma_{e,i}^{\kappa,+} - \gamma_{e,i}^{\kappa,-}\right) \quad \forall \kappa \in \{1,\dots,k\}$
 $g \in \mathbb{R}^{2}$
 $\hat{x}_{\kappa} \in \mathbb{Z}^{4} \quad \forall \kappa \in \{1,\dots,k\}$
 $\gamma_{e,i}^{\kappa,+}, \gamma_{e,i}^{\kappa,-} \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{2} \quad \forall e \in \{b,r,y\}, i \in \{s,m,\ell\}, \kappa \in \{1,\dots,k\}$
 $\left(\sum_{\kappa=1}^{k} \left(\mathbb{1}^{\top} \gamma_{e,i}^{\kappa,+} + \mathbb{1}^{\top} \gamma_{e,i}^{\kappa,-}\right) \leq B_{i}^{e} \quad \forall e \in \{b,r,y\}, i \in \{s,m,\ell\}, \kappa \in \{1,\dots,k\} \right)$
 $\left(\operatorname{SOS-1} \left(\gamma_{e,i}^{\kappa,+}, \gamma_{e,i}^{\kappa,-}\right) \quad \forall e \in \{b,r,y\}, i \in \{s,m,\ell\}, \kappa \in \{1,\dots,k\} \right)$

Algorithm 1 Zometool Shape Contour Approximation Scheme

Input: (Zome-)DAS $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{B})$, parameter $\delta \geq 0$, shape contour \mathcal{F}

Output: a shortest \mathcal{F} -resembling \mathcal{G} -cycle running through all δ -neighborhoods of all sample points

1: obtain sample points p_1, \ldots, p_k along \mathcal{F}

- 2: set up and solve the MIP (5)
- 3: for each segment $1, \ldots, k$ between the computed (Zometool) nodes $(g + \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\})$ do
- 4: obtain an approximation error minimizing sequence of the associated selected struts
- 5: return \mathcal{F} -resembling \mathcal{G} -cycle consisting of the concatentation of segment-optimal \mathcal{G} -paths

We remark that (5) may take a prohibitively long time to fully solve (i.e., compute a certifiably optimal solution or detect model infeasibility) even with state-of-the-art commercial MIP solvers like Gurobi or CPLEX. In fact, this observation already holds true for the considerably simpler DPC problem (3). It may be worth mentioning that this should generally be attributed to the respective problems' NP-hardness (cf. Section 2), not the mixed-integer programming approach itself. Nevertheless, we empirically observed that if a good ("short") solution exists, (3) is solved to optimality by modern MIP solvers very quickly. This motivates, on the one hand, the extension from DPC to DCA-S (i.e., to (5)), and on the other hand, suggests a simple time-limit-heuristic to judge model infeasibility or (sufficient for our purposes) undesirability of possible "long" solutions: If the solution process takes more than (say) a few minutes to either find any feasible solution or one with acceptable optimality gap, terminate and declare that no good solutions exist or at least can be found quickly (within the current model parameters/design decisions). When finding relatively good solutions is not a problem, but progress stalls and it takes too long to determine exact optimality, we may of course also terminate prematurely and simply use the \mathcal{G} -cycle from the current best known solution. The MIP optimality gap then allows to judge how "far" from optimal the solution thus retrieved still is, i.e., how much improvement (w.r.t. the number of utilized struts) could still be possible by letting the solver continue. Often, good MIP solutions are indeed found relatively quickly, and most of the remaining solver running time is spent proving optimality (by improving dual bounds until the optimality gap is closed).

Finally, it is worth noting that we also considered penalizing arclength deviation as a different objective, or in a weighted combination with the cardinality objective from (5), and furthermore considered (lower and/or upper) bounding the segment arclengths to a factor of the associated input contour segment's arclength. The arclength difference can be seen as another loose proxy for the approximation error (being small if the latter is, though not necessarily vice versa) that can be evaluated regardless of the final global positioning of the DAS-structure. While such model modifications might yield slight improvements (w.r.t. the visual perception of the resulting shape approximation quality) in some cases, at least the objective variations appear to make the MIPs significantly harder to solve, and the obtained solutions seemed more likely to lead to self-intersections ("non-planarity"). Therefore, we do not consider these modifications any further in the following.

3.2 Algorithm for Zometool Shape Contour Approximation

In order to obtain a practical method able to produce good results, two aspects remained open so far: The *(model) design decision* of how to choose appropriate sample points (and the neighborhood radius δ), and the *solution construction*, i.e., how to determine the "best" (valid) \mathcal{F} -resembling \mathcal{G} -cycle among all those sharing the same combination of struts per segment that was computed by the above MIP. (Recall that any DAS path can be rearranged without disconnecting its endpoints simply by permuting its struts/edges.) Indeed, the MIP (5) is the main "work horse" for our shape approximation method, and we combine it with shape contour sampling and optimal \mathcal{F} -resembling \mathcal{G} -cycle construction to the overall scheme outlined in Algorithm 1.

The shape contour \mathcal{F} can be given, e.g., as a parametric function or implicitly via a distance function/field. Any sampling scheme naturally depends on how \mathcal{F} is provided or can be accessed. In the following, we describe a quite general setting that we also used in our implementation: distance fields and piecewiselinear \mathcal{F} obtained from these. More precisely, assume we are given a (discretized) distance field covering a rectangular portion of \mathbb{R}^2 , in the form of a matrix of values specifying the average distance of points within small square cells in 2D space (i.e., every matrix entry is the average distance value for such a cell). The size of these squares' sides is determined relative to the (shortest) strut length of the employed DAS by a scaling/accuracy parameter s, where for s = 1, a globally fixed ratio is used. (Thus, for s > 1, struts become longer relative to the input shape.) With infinite discretization precision, points lying exactly on the shape contour (boundary) would yield a distance value of zero. We assume that circle-like shapes are processed, i.e., the shape contours are closed curves that enclose exactly one connected area, so that the terms "inside" and "outside" of the shape are well-defined. Thus, cells containing points that (mostly) lie inside the shape have negative distance values, and those outside have positive distance values. Such a distance field provides a simple way to evaluate struct costs, and can also be used to obtain a polygonal approximation of the true shape by applying a 2D version of the marching cubes algorithm [10]. This approximation is what we will, for simplicity, henceforth refer to as \mathcal{F} ; note that it is piecewise-linear and fully described by an ordered sequence of points, say $p_1^{\mathcal{F}}, \ldots, p_n^{\mathcal{F}}$.

3.2.1 Sampling the Input Shape Contour

Since the MIP (5) is oblivious to \mathcal{F} beyond enforcing the placement of Zometool nodes in the vicinity of sample points, a careful selection of the sample points (which define the partition of the \mathcal{G} -cycle into segments) is crucial for ensuring that the \mathcal{G} -cycle to be computed actually does closely resemble \mathcal{F} . The selection should ideally achieve a balance between several competing goals: To keep the MIP small (and therefore easier to solve), the number of segments should not be too large. However, long segments contain many struts (leading to larger effort to enumerate permutations in the final step of the overall algorithm) and the MIP objective of minimizing the number of struts will lead to strut sequences that lose resemblance to \mathcal{F} (cutting off "nooks and crannies" of the contour). We found that this last aspect appears to be the most problematic, if one is willing to spend some time on the MIP optimization. Similarly, the box-radius δ for the MIP should not be set too small, lest the MIP becomes infeasible, but not too large either, since we want to ensure the \mathcal{G} -cycle remains close to \mathcal{F} at least around the sample points.

Thus, the crucial sampling phase of our algorithm is of a "high-level" heuristic nature; similarly, so is splitting the low-level optimization into the MIP (feasibility) part and the (optimality) part in which struts are rearranged to minimize the approximation error. Indeed, finding the optimal sample point selection is essentially equivalent to solving the entire problem, because if we knew it (and assuming δ is sufficiently large), all that would remain is finding and arranging the struts that achieve minimum approximation error. Moreover, if the sampling is "very good", the decomposition into MIP and strut-rearrangement can be expected to closely resemble what could be achieved by the abstract algorithm that could directly compute minimum approximation error solutions. (Recall that such a method is impracticable, since approximation errors can only be evaluated once strut locations are fixed.) Therefore, it is worth trying to design a sampling mechanism that targets the possibly problematic aspects mentioned above and also aims at retaining a MIP subproblem that is sufficiently tractable in practice.

We have implemented and tested the following sampling schemes:

- 1. Uniformly by arclength: Determine the (approximate) arclength a of \mathcal{F} (here, the sum of the lengths of all straight lines between neighboring points $p_i^{\mathcal{F}}$). Starting with an arbitrary point, say $p_1 \coloneqq p_1^{\mathcal{F}}$, pick the others by moving from the previous point along the sequence of points defining \mathcal{F} until the traversed curve segment reaches the average segment arclength a/k, and select the current point in that sequence as the next respective sample point.
- 2. By curvature: For each $p_i^{\mathcal{F}}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, we can obtain approximate curvature information w.r.t. \mathcal{F} as

$$c_i \coloneqq \arccos\left(\frac{\left(p_{(i-t)_n}^{\mathcal{F}} - p_i^{\mathcal{F}}\right)^{\top} \left(p_{(i+t)_n}^{\mathcal{F}} - p_i^{\mathcal{F}}\right)}{\left\|p_{(i-t)_n}^{\mathcal{F}} - p_i^{\mathcal{F}}\right\|_2 \cdot \left\|p_{(i+t)_n}^{\mathcal{F}} - p_i^{\mathcal{F}}\right\|_2}\right),$$

which gives the angle (in radians) between the vectors connecting $p_i^{\mathcal{F}}$ with its *t*-th predecessor and *t*-th successor (in the ordered sequence defining \mathcal{F}), respectively, where $(j)_n$ denotes the index correctly shifted periodically back into $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, so, e.g., $(j)_n = j - n$ for $n + 1 \leq j \leq 2n$ and $(j)_n = n - j$ for $-n < j \leq 0$. Here, $t \geq 1$ can be chosen arbitrarily; t = 1 works, but larger values, say 5 or 10, could stabilize against tiny "kinks" in the contour that are not really relevant w.r.t. the actual shape. It holds that $c_i \in [0, \pi]$ for all *i*, where values close to $\pi/2$ amount to steep angles ($\pi/2$ signifies a 90° turn) and values close to 0 or π indicate flat regions (0° or, equivalently, 180°). For simplicity, let us define adjusted curvatures

$$\bar{c}_i \coloneqq \min\{c_i, \pi - c_i\} \in [0, \pi/2];$$

note that steep angles now simply coincide with large adjusted curvature values.

As a DAS is generally better suited to approximating relatively flat curves, and (especially when minimizing the number of edges/struts that is used) indeed tends to ignore or "cut off" bends in the contour along a segment, it intuitively makes sense to take curvature information into account when selecting sample points, in an effort to reduce the occurrence of such undesirable cut-offs. We considered several different schemes based on the (adjusted) curvature values:

(a) Global largest \bar{c} -values: Pick the k points with largest \bar{c} -values as sample points.

- (b) Segment-wise largest \bar{c} -values: First determine the segments (e.g., by arclength as described above) and then pick the k sample points as the respective points of \mathcal{F} with largest (adjusted) curvature from each respective segment.
- (c) Separation-based: Repeat picking an available point of largest \bar{c} -value as a sample point and marking all points in segments of arclength up to $\lambda a/k$ in both directions along \mathcal{F} from this point on as unavailable, until k points were chosen. Here, $\lambda > 0$ determines how large the unsampled segments may become; e.g., aiming at equal-arclength segments, one could set $\lambda = 0.5$. (Note that overly small values of λ may lead to a bad, local concentration of the chosen sample points, whereas too large values could result in having marked all remaining points as unavailable before k sample points were chosen.)
- 3. By curvature with gap-filling: Choosing points solely based on curvature information may lead to inadequate sampling of "less curvy" segments of the input contour. This can be avoided by augmenting a separation-based curvature sampling similar to the one detailed above with a point-insertion scheme aiming at an efficient coverage of underrepresented segments with further sample points:
 - (a) Separation-based with Euclidean farthest-point insertion: Choose (up to) a fixed number k_c of sample points based on (adjusted) curvature obeying arclength separation requirements, then add more points by iteratively picking a point with maximum minimal Euclidean distance to one of the already selected sample points (up to a given maximum number k', and stopping early when the distances fall below a certain threshold).
 - (b) Separation-based with arclength-based farthest-point insertion: Again choose (up to) k_c sample points based on curvature with separation requirements, then add more points by iteratively picking a point with maximum minimal arclength distance to one of the already selected sample points (up to a given maximum number k', and stopping early when the distances fall below a certain threshold).

(Here, in (a) and (b), $k \le k_c + k'$ then denotes the final number of adaptively selected sample points.)

Generally, the more sample points are chosen, the less pronounced the differences between the different sampling schemes become. When keeping an eye not only on the sampling quality but also on the MIP size (i.e., trying to keep it small), preliminary experiments indicated that the final curvature- and separation-based variant with arclength-based farthest-point insertion, i.e., 3(b), seems to give the best results when using a managable amount of sample points. Therefore, this is the sampling scheme we recommend for use in Algorithm 1 and the one employed in the numerical experiments discussed later.

3.2.2 Constructing the Zome Cycle

As already mentioned, it is up to the concrete definition of an error measure to identify the "best" sequence of struts in a \mathcal{G} -path. Here, we make use of the distance field that is provided as input (cf. Section 3.2.1) and employ a simple averaged area approximation: For a strut e with endpoints p_1 and p_2 , we compute its "approximation error" (cost) a_e as

$$a_e \coloneqq \frac{\|p_1 - p_2\|_2}{k+2} \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} \left| d\left(\frac{i}{k+1}p_1 + (1 - \frac{i}{k+1})p_2\right) \right|,$$

where we use k = 3, and d(p) is the value of the distance field cell containing point p. In case p lies beyond the boundaries of the given distance field, we let d(p) be the value of the closest field cell multiplied with a penalty of 100. (Note that in order to avoid such penalties, the given distance field should extend sufficiently far "outside" of the shape contour.)

Thus, our error measure is entirely separable and the total cost of a given \mathcal{G} -cycle C with segments $\mathcal{S}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_k$ can be written as

$$a(C,\mathcal{F}) = \sum_{\kappa=1}^{k} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{S}_{\kappa}} a_e.$$
(6)

In Algorithm 1, the final step consists of constructing the actual Zome cycle using the number of struts (of each type) for each segment obtained from the MIP. To find the best permutation of struts for each segment w.r.t. the cost function defined above, we can resort to total enumeration (with some reduction of the computational effort by aborting enumeration of subsequences that are provably worse than the respective current best bound). Since this requires an undesirably long time for segments containing more than roughly 15 struts, we also implemented a greedy construction scheme which iteratively constructs the path from the segment's starting point to its end point by appending the cheapest one of the remaining



Figure 4: Experimental results for test shape "lion" for different scaling and sampling parameter choices. Subfigures (a)-(c) and (d)-(f) show the results when terminating the MIP after 300 or 900 seconds, resp.

struts. In our experiments, we usually ended up with sufficiently short (i.e., few-strut) segments to use the exact (total enumeration) construction method; nevertheless, empirically, the greedy method delivers comparable results.

4 Experiments

We implemented our algorithm in C, using Gurobi 8.0 as MIP solver; the code can be obtained from the first author's homepage. Our former colleague Ole Untzelmann provided the Contour Explorer plugin for Open Flipper [16], which allows to extract the input data (distance field, polygonal contour approximation \mathcal{F}) for our "ZomeDCAS" program from slices of 3D object models or based on given images (e.g., scans of handdrawn shapes); here, all test images were generated from licence-free pictures found on the internet. The experiments were run under Linux on a quad-core machine with Intel i5-4590 CPUs (3.30 GHz, 6 MB cache) and 16 GB main memory.

We used the sampling scheme 3(b) in all experiments, requiring an arclength equivalent to the length of three longest (i.e., long blue) struts separating the points chosen based on (adjusted) curvature, and half that for the subsequent farthest-point insertion. The total number of sample points was limited to 150 (which was not reached in any of the experiments here). In the MIP, we do employ SOS-1 constraints, and allow the solver Gurobi to run in concurrent mode on all CPU cores, each with a (wall-clock) time limit of 900 seconds. Finally, we use the exact strut-enumeration method to construct the output Zome cycle with smallest approximation error. Deviations from this setup in specific experiments will be stated explicitly.

Initialization and cycle construction times combined were well below 10 seconds on all test instances, so the majority of the runtime is spent in MIP solving. Our program also generates tikz code to visualize the contour and Zome approximation: the respective input contour is drawn in black and Zome struts in their respective colors; the boxes around sampling points are shown as grey squares, the slightly darker one contains the Zome origin (best seen in the electronic version of the paper, zooming in). The green contour shows the rough piecewise-linear approximation of the input shape that can be obtained by connecting neighboring sample points directly (this is *not* a DAS/Zome-construction). Note that in the Zome constructions, segments of the same color may—and often do—consist of a sequence of struts, not necessarily a single one. The results of our computational experiments are presented in Figures 4 and 5.

The "lion" examples seen in Figure 4 highlight several aspects of the general algorithm behavior. Firstly, a higher "resolution" (corresponding to a smaller scaling parameter s) naturally allows for better shape



Figure 5: Experimental results for various test shapes. (MIP time limit: 900 seconds).

approximation, since struts of fixed lengths can be better fitted to a relatively larger input contour than to a smaller one. In this regard, it is noteworthy that the MIP progress is apparently not hindered by the fact that smaller s lead to more sample points and, consequently, more segments and larger MIP sizes—the achieved gaps are roughly the same as for larger s (and smaller MIPs). Indeed, it stands to reason that small s might actually make it easier for the solver to find (good) feasible solutions, since the requirement to find segment-paths with end nodes in the specified sample point neighborhoods intuitively becomes less restrictive. (For larger s, the relatively longer strut lengths make the strut orientation restrictions more relevant.) The larger MIP size then might counteract this possible benefit and increases the overall runtime again. Nevertheless, increasing s generally still leads to easier problems—either infeasibility can be proven relatively quickly, or the smaller MIP can even be solved to optimality (if feasible solutions exist), see Figure 5(g)–(i), where the last and smallest problem (with s = 10) was optimally solved after about 321 seconds, though the resulting shape approximations are of course much coarser.

Visually comparing the results in Figure 4, we also see that using a shorter time limit (here, 5 minutes

versus the default 15) can still produce similarly good solutions; we omit providing the concrete values for $a(C, \mathcal{F})$ (cf. (6)), as we did not find those particularly helpful. (We remark that the reported MIP optimality gaps do not pertain to the final approximation error, but show how much improvement w.r.t. minimizing the number of utilized struts could still be achieved (at most) by letting the MIP solver continue.) For other instances, however, 5 minutes were in fact not sufficient to find any feasible solution (e.g., for the dog-walker instance with the same parameters as in Figure 5(b)), so allowing longer running times seems advisable before aborting and trying a different (scaling and/or) sampling setup. Moreover, as mentioned before, our algorithm does not explicitly avoid strut collisions in the computed solutions. Indeed, the output may be "slightly non-planar", exhibiting a few edge/strut crossings that can easily be repaired (by rearranging the struts in the affected segments). Also, although one might expect solutions with fewer struts to be less likely to exhibit such collision issues, comparing Figure 4(c) and (f), such intuition cannot be confirmed in general (inspect and compare the lion's tail) and depends on the distribution of sample points and the value δ (in the tail, two boxes actually overlap, and a "double" Zome node was placed in the intersection—a feasible, but perhaps still undesirable type of collision). We will discuss some options to disentangle strut overlaps in the concluding remarks later.

Finally, notice the effect of choosing more points by (adjusted) curvature before sampling the remaining uncovered segments of the input shape contour by farthest-point insertion: Especially the feet and chestmane of the lion are more accurately approximated in Figures 4(c) and (f) than in Figures 4(b) and (e), respectively.

The more diverse computational results in Figure 5 demonstrate that our proposed algorithm is indeed capable of obtaining good DAS/Zometool approximations of given shape contours within reasonable time. (In fact, considering that actually building the computed representation using the Zometool kit, i.e., assembling the shape approximation by following the computed "construction manual" consisting of (sometimes) several hundred struts arranged in a certain order, would likely take a person several hours, spending even more computational efforts in obtaining high-quality solutions could be justified.) It is worth pointing out that some of the images were chosen specifically to provide a challenge for our automated algorithm pipeline (especially the sampling scheme): The shapes in Figures 5(b), (c) and (d), in particular, have both quite "curvy" parts and narrow parts. Nevertheless, the overall quality of the computed approximations allow to conclude that, all in all, our sampling scheme successfully addresses the necessity to carefully sample "curvy" regions, and that the idea of targeting few-strut representations of segments between sample points (or their neighborhoods) provides a suitable proxy to induce \mathcal{F} -resemblance that mostly also succeeds in providing strut collections that are then arranged without dramatic collision issues in regions such as the narrow parts.

5 Concluding Remarks

While it is often achieved automatically (cf. Figures 5(a), (e), (f), (g), (i) and Figure 4), having no guarantee that edge (or node) overlaps are avoided is a present drawback of our method. Node collisions (i.e., placing two DAS nodes on top of one another) can be avoided a priori by ensuring that the neighborhoods $\mathcal{N}^{\rho}_{\delta}(p_i)$ are disjoint, either by reducing δ accordingly or by modifying pairs of overlapping neighborhoods directly. To disentangle edge collisions, the strut enumeration procedure, i.e., the last phase of our Algorithm 1, can be extended to be "planarity-aware". For instance, we could integrate a postprocessing procedure that tries to automatically detect and repair collisions by suitably rearranging struts, ideally aiming at keeping the increase in approximation error to a minimum. A very simple way to do this, and that can easily be seen to locally guarantee resolution of the collision, would be to rearrange the struts of the affected two \mathcal{G} -path/cycle segments so that one segment is "convex" and the other "concave", i.e., the segments then "bend" away from each other. (Globally, this could introduce new collisions and thus might have to be iterated.) We leave the details of a good (in terms of approximation error) and efficient realization of these matters for future work.

Given that the DAS setting allows only certain angles between the struts, it is conceivable that including a global rotation (of the input shape) in the optimization could yield even better results than what we achieved here using a fixed global orientation. This could, in principle, be integrated into the MIP (5) by (left-)multiplying each sample point $p_k \in \mathbb{R}^2$ by a rotation matrix

$$R_{\theta} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta) & -\sin(\theta) \\ \sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta) \end{pmatrix},$$

with variable $\theta \in [0, \pi]$ representing the (counter-clockwise) rotation degree. However, the nonlinearities introduced by the sine and cosine functions would further complicate the MIP. To keep things linear throughout, one could discretize the range for θ , or perhaps restrict to just a few selected angles such as those occurring in the DAS.

As mentioned in the introduction, we ultimately hope to extend the methodology proposed in this paper to the task of 3D shape approximation. Our algorithm constitutes the first important step in towards this

goal. An idea to achieve the extension is to slice a given 3D object and use the general scheme introduced here to obtain DAS approximations of these slices along with DAS connections between them. To that end, note that our method can be straightforwardly extended to handle "chords" and "protrusions" of the input shape (i.e., curve segments that either connect two points of the main contour or lead from the contour to a point outside of it). If, for instance, the crucial points (where a chord or protrusion "leaves" the main contour) could be identified (automatically) and selected as required sample points, the new elements can indeed be incorporated into the MIP by additional point-connectivity constraints of the same kind as used in the present work to ensure \mathcal{F} -resemblance. How this identification could be realized in practice will likely depend strongly on how exactly the input shape is provided/represented. An alternative approach could be to first solve the problem for the main contour, and then sequentially include chords by finding DAS connections between the already-placed nodes closest to the end points of the chords (and similarly for protrusions). Once the method can handle these extensions, the "slicing" idea can be realized by using the concept of chords to enforce connections between the different DAS slice approximations, either in a sequential manner or in a single large MIP (note that moving from 2D to 3D coordinates is straightforward). It will be interesting to see how this envisioned extension will work in practice for the 3D shape approximation tasks we have in mind.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the Excellence Initiative of the German federal and state governments and the Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz program of the DFG.

References

- P. K. Agarwal and S. Suri, "Surface approximation and geometric partitions," SIAM J. Comput., vol. 27, pp. 1016–1035, 1998.
- [2] E. M. Arkin, J. S. B. Mitchell, and C. D. Piatko, "Bicriteria shortest path problems in the plane," in Proc. 3rd Canad. Conf. Comput. Geom., 1991, pp. 153–156.
- [3] D. Z. Chen, O. Daescu, and K. S. Klenk, "On Geometric Path Query Problems," Int'l J. Comput. Geom. Appl., vol. 11, no. 06, pp. 617–645, 2001.
- [4] T. Davis, "The Mathematics of Zome," available online at www.geometer.org/mathcircles/zome.pdf, 2007.
- [5] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson, Computers and Intractability. A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness. W. H. Freeman and Company, 1979.
- [6] L. J. Guibas, J. E. Hershberger, J. S. B. Mitchell, and J. S. Snoeyink, "Approximating polygons and subdivisions with minimum link paths," in *Proc. 2nd International Symposium on Algorithms (ISA'91)*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, W. L. Hsu and R. C. T. Lee, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 1991, vol. 557, pp. 151–162.
- [7] G. W. Hart and H. Picciotto, Zome Geometry. Key Curriculum Press, 2001.
- [8] J. E. Hershberger and J. S. Snoeyink, "Computing minimum length paths of a given homotopy class," *Comput. Geom.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 63–97, 1994.
- [9] I. Kostitsyna, M. Löffler, V. Polishchuk, and F. Staals, "On the complexity of minimum-link path problems," in 32nd International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG), ser. Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics, S. Fekete and A. Lubiw, Eds., vol. 51. Germany: Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, 2016, pp. 49:1–49:16.
- [10] W. E. Lorensen and H. E. Cline, "Marching cubes: A high resolution 3D surface construction algorithm," in *Proc. SIGGRAPH*. New York: ACM, 1987, pp. 163–169.
- [11] J. S. B. Mitchell, "Shortest Paths and Networks," in *Handbook of Computational Geometry*, 3rd ed. (to appear), J. E. Goodman, J. O'Rourke, and C. D. Tóth, Eds. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2017, pp. 811–848.
- [12] J. S. B. Mitchell, C. D. Piatko, and E. M. Arkin, "Computing a shortest k-link path in a polygon," in Proc. 33rd Ann. Symp. Found. Comput. Sci. IEEE, 1992, pp. 573–582.

- [13] J. S. B. Mitchell and V. Polishchuk, "Minimum-perimeter enclosures," Inf. Process. Lett., vol. 107, no. 3–4, pp. 120–124, 2008.
- [14] J. S. B. Mitchell, V. Polishchuk, and M. Sysikaski, "Minimum-link paths revisited," Comput. Geom., vol. 47, no. 6, pp. 651–667, 2014.
- [15] J. S. B. Mitchell, G. Rote, and G. Woeginger, "Minimum-link paths among obstacles in the plane," *Algorithmica*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 431–459, 1992.
- [16] J. Möbius and L. Kobbelt, "OpenFlipper: An Open Source Geometry Processing and Rendering Framework," in *Curves and Surfaces*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, J.-D. Boissonnat, P. Chenin, A. Cohen, C. Gout, T. Lyche, M.-L. Mazure, and L. Schumaker, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2012, vol. 6920, pp. 488–500, Program code and website: www.openflipper.org.
- [17] B. J. Nilsson, T. Ottmann, S. Schuierer, and C. Icking, "Restricted orientation computational geometry," in *Data structures and efficient algorithms: Final Report on the DFG Special Joint Initiative*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, B. Monien and T. Ottmann, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 1992, vol. 594, pp. 148–185.
- [18] C. D. Piatko, "Geometric Bicriteria Optimal Path Problems," Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA, 1993.
- [19] G. Reich, "Finitely-oriented shortest paths in the presence of polygonal obstacles," Institut f
 ür Informatik, Universität Freiburg, Germany, Tech. Rep. Bericht 39, 1991.
- [20] H. Zimmer and L. Kobbelt, "Zometool Rationalization of Freeform Surfaces," IEEE Trans. Vis. Comput. Graph., vol. 20, no. 10, pp. 1461–1473, 2014.
- [21] H. Zimmer, F. Lafarge, P. Alliez, and L. Kobbelt, "Zometool Shape Approximation," *Graph. Models*, vol. 76, no. 5, pp. 390–401, 2014, Special Issue "Geometric Modeling and Processing 2014".