

Covering a Curve with Subtrajectories*

Hugo A. Akitaya[†], Frederik Brünig[‡], Erin Chambers[§], Anne Driemel[¶]

March 1, 2025

Abstract

We study subtrajectory clustering under the Fréchet distance. Given a polygonal curve P with n vertices, and parameters k and ℓ , the goal is to find k center curves of complexity at most ℓ such that every point on P is covered by a subtrajectory that has small Fréchet distance to one of the k center curves. We suggest a new approach to solving this problem based on a set cover formulation leading to polynomial-time approximation algorithms. Our solutions rely on carefully designed set system oracles for systems of subtrajectories.

1 Introduction

Many applications use recorded sequences of positions of moving objects, such as migrating animals, sports players, traffic. Other types of movement are also possible, such as in gesture analysis or eye tracking. Given the nature of the data acquisition, we usually model such trajectory data as piecewise linear curves in \mathbb{R}^d . One particular question which has gotten much attention relates to clustering trajectory data; typically, one wishes to extract good representative curves that summarize the data well. This necessitates a notion of similarity to compare and evaluate simplified representations of curves. The Fréchet distance is one such measure, which in addition to geometric closeness also takes the flow of the curve into account; see the next section for the precise definition. In this paper, we consider the problem of covering an input curve with a small set of representative curves, where every portion of the input curve is similar to some representative under the Fréchet distance. Our main focus is to recast this problem in a set system framework and to study approximation algorithms for the corresponding set cover problem.

Related work. There are a number of heuristic approaches for clustering trajectories [23] as well as more theoretical approaches based on similarity measures [22] and relative homology [21]. The problem is often studied in a setting where each of the trajectories to be clustered is given as an immutable element of a specific metric space. In subtrajectory clustering, however, the goal is to find self-similarities within one long trajectory (see Figure 1 for an example). To this end, we ask to find a suitable decomposition that splits the input trajectory into smaller subsections (subtrajectories) that can be clustered. Alternatively, we may ask for a covering instead of a decomposition by allowing subtrajectories to overlap each other. There are many different variants of subtrajectory clustering studied and heuristics have been proposed [17, 19].

One of the earlier theoretical results for subtrajectory clustering under the Fréchet distance [7, 16] focuses on finding one cluster of long subtrajectories that are similar to each other, optimizing different parameters. They also show that finding an optimal cluster is NP-complete. In subsequent work, the algorithmic techniques were shown to be useful for map construction [5, 6].

*This research was initiated at the Eighth Annual Workshop on Geometry and Graphs, held at the Bellairs Research Institute in Barbados, January 31 – February 7, 2020. The authors are grateful to the organizers and to the participants of this workshop. Anne Driemel acknowledges funding from the DFG (project nr. 313421352).

[†]School of Computer Science, Carleton University, Canada. Supported by NSERC.

[‡]Department of Computer Science, University of Bonn, Germany

[§]Department of Computer Science, Saint Louis University, USA.

[¶]Hausdorff Center for Mathematics, University of Bonn, Germany.




Figure 1: Left: Example of a possible subtrajectory cluster within the trajectory of a soccer player; Right: Example (k, ℓ) -clustering [9].

Recently, the authors of [1] proposed to study facility location for subtrajectory clustering under the discrete Fréchet distance. They present $O(\log m)$ -approximation algorithms, where m is the number of points on the input curve. The main algorithm runs in $O(|B|m^3)$ if B is a set of candidate center curves given with the input. They show how to generate a suitable set B of size $O(m^2)$, and how to reduce the size to $O(m)$ at the expense of an additional $O(\log m)$ -factor in the approximation quality.

Our work is different from [1] in many ways. We restrict the complexity of admissible center curves and we use the continuous Fréchet distance. The authors of [1] also consider a set cover problem as an intermediate step of their algorithm, but their formulation leads to a set system of exponential size. Our approach instead puts a set system at the center of the problem definition, and our main contribution is a careful formulation of suitable set systems of much smaller size that lend themselves to efficient approximation.

Our work draws from ideas and techniques developed in works on the (k, ℓ) -clustering variant for trajectories [14, 8, 20, 10], where the complexity of centers is restricted, as well as fundamental work on computing hitting sets of set systems for low VC-dimension [4], which have previously not been applied to subtrajectory clustering. Given a polygonal curve P with n vertices, and parameters k and ℓ , the goal is to find k center curves of complexity at most ℓ such that every point on P is covered by a subtrajectory, that has small Fréchet distance to one of the k center curves.

2 Preliminaries

A sequence of n points $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ defines a **polygonal curve** P by linearly interpolating consecutive points, that is, for each i , we obtain the **edge** $\{tp_i + (1-t)p_{i+1} | t \in [0, 1]\}$. We may think of P resulting from the concatenation of the edges in the given order as a parametrized curve, that is, a function $P : [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$. Note that for any such parametrized curve we can find real values $s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_n$, such that $P(s_i) = p_i$. We call the ordered set of the p_i the **vertices** of P and we denote it with $V(P)$. We call the number of vertices n the **complexity** of the curve. For any two $a, b \in [0, 1]$ we denote with $P[a, b]$ the **subcurve** of P that starts at $P(a)$ and ends at $P(b)$.

Let $\mathbb{X}_\ell^d = (\mathbb{R}^d)^\ell$. We think of the elements of this set as sequences of ℓ points in \mathbb{R}^d , the set of all polygonal curves of ℓ vertices in \mathbb{R}^d .

For two parametrized curves P and Q , we define their **Fréchet distance** as

$$d_F(P, Q) = \inf_{\gamma: [0, 1] \mapsto [0, 1]} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \|P(\gamma(t)) - Q(t)\|,$$

where γ ranges over all strictly monotone increasing functions. A curve $Q \in \mathbb{X}_\ell^d$ is an ℓ -**simplification** of a curve P if its Fréchet distance is minimum among all curves in \mathbb{X}_ℓ^d . Let X be a set. We call a set \mathcal{R} , where any $r \in \mathcal{R}$ is of the form $r \subseteq X$ a **set system** with **ground set** X . Let \mathcal{R} be a set system with

ground set X . A **set cover** of \mathcal{R} is a subset $S \subset \mathcal{R}$ such that the ground set is covered by the union of the sets in S . The **set cover problem** asks to find a set cover for a given \mathcal{R} of minimum size.

3 Problem definition and results

Let P be a polygonal curve given by a sequence of points $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and endowed with a set of m real values $0 = t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_m = 1$ which define a set of subcurves of the form $S_{ij} = P[t_i, t_j]$. We denote the set of values t_i with \mathcal{T} and we refer to the respective points on the curve $P(t_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ as **breakpoints**. Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$ be fixed parameters.

Consider the set system \mathcal{R} with ground set $X = \{1, \dots, m-1\}$ where each set $r_Q \in \mathcal{R}$ is defined by a polygonal curve $Q \in \mathbb{X}_\ell^d$ as follows

$$r_Q = \{z \in X \mid \exists i \leq z < j \text{ with } d_F(Q, P[t_i, t_j]) \leq \Delta\} \quad (1)$$

The main problem we are studying in this paper is to compute minimum-size set covers for set systems defined as above; the set system framework allows us to draw from a rich background of techniques in computing set covers. Our motivation to study this problem is the related clustering problem, where we think of Q as a candidate for a cluster center and the curves $P[t_i, t_j]$ as subcurves that are to be clustered. The goal is to cover the entire curve P with a small number of metric balls centered at polygonal curves of low complexity. More precisely, we want to find a minimum-size set of polygonal curves $C \subset \mathbb{X}_\ell^d$, such that the cost of clustering P under the Fréchet distance is at most Δ ; here, we break P into subcurves determined by the breakpoints, each of which must match to some curve of C . We define the cost function

$$\phi(P, C) = \min_{I \subseteq \mathcal{S}} \max_{(i,j) \in I} \min_{q \in C} d_F(P[t_i, t_j], q),$$

where $\mathcal{S} = \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq m\}$, and we require that I satisfies

$$[0, 1] = \bigcup_{(i,j) \in I} [t_i, t_j].$$

I represents a set of intervals starting and ending at breakpoints that together cover the parametrization interval of P . The problem we study in this paper is to find a set of cluster centers $C \subset \mathbb{X}_\ell^d$ of size k , such that $\phi(P, C) \leq \Delta$.

It is important to note that we do not compute a clustering of the set of subcurves of P . Instead, we want to find a covering of the curve P with subcurves that allows for a good clustering.

Results. In this paper, we show results of the following form. Let $P : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a polygonal curve of complexity n with breakpoints $0 \leq t_1, \dots, t_m \leq 1$. Assume there exists a set $C \subset \mathbb{X}_\ell^d$ of size k , such that $\phi(P, C) \leq \Delta$. We show that there exists an algorithm \mathcal{A} that computes a set $C' \subset \mathbb{X}_{\ell'}^d$ of size k' such that $\phi(P, C') \leq \Delta'$, where the quality of the approximation (namely k' , ℓ' , and Δ') varies, as does the running time. Table 1 gives an overview of results.

\mathcal{A}	k'	ℓ'	Δ'	running time	Reference
1	$O(k \log m)$	ℓ	3Δ	$O(m^3 n \ell + m^4 + m^2 T_S(n, \ell))$	Theorem 3
2	$O(k \log m)$	ℓ	$O(\Delta)$	$\tilde{O}(m^4 \ell^2 + n + m^2 T_S(n, \ell))$	Theorem 5
3	$O(k \text{ polylog } m)$	2ℓ	$O(\Delta)$	$\tilde{O}(km^2 \ell^2 + mn)$	Theorem 28

Table 1: Overview of results. We use $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ to denote asymptotic running times omitting logarithmic factors. $T_S(n, \ell)$ is the running time to compute an ℓ -simplification of a curve of $P[t_i, t_j]$ for any $0 \leq i < j \leq 1$.

Overview. In Section 4 we define a modified set system and show that the greedy set cover algorithm can be applied. The first two results in Table 1 are obtained by combining this with efficient set system oracles. The third result in Table 2 is achieved by a careful implementation of the set cover algorithm by Brönniman and Goodrich [4]. This is our main result. Again, the crucial step is the formulation of a suitable set system that is amenable to efficient set system oracles. In Section 5 we describe the details for the case that cluster centers are line segments. The general case $\ell \geq 2$ is treated in Section 6. The details of the set cover algorithm are described in Section 7. In addition, we show in Section 8 that even when fixing $\ell = 1$ and minimizing k , the clustering problem is NP-hard, via a reduction from PLANAR-MONOTONE-3SAT. In Section 9 we show that the VC-dimension of the set system dual to \mathcal{R} is in $\Theta(\log m)$.

4 A set system for approximation

We now want to modify the set system in a way that preserves the initial structure but allows for more efficient approximations of the clustering problem.

For any $(i, j) \in \mathcal{S}$ let $\mu_\ell(P[t_i, t_j])$ denote the ℓ -simplification of the corresponding subcurve of P . Consider a set system $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0$ defined on the ground set $X = \{1, \dots, m-1\}$, where each set $r_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0$ for $(i, j) \in \mathcal{S}$ is of the form

$$r_{i,j} = \{z \in X \mid \exists i' \leq z < j' \text{ with } d_F(P[t_{i'}, t_{j'}], \mu_\ell(P[t_i, t_j])) \leq 3\Delta\}$$

We will see, that $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0$ approximates the structure of \mathcal{R} as defined in (1) to the extent that a set cover for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0$ corresponds to an approximate solution for our clustering problem. The following lemma shows that any set cover of size k for \mathcal{R} implies a set cover of size k in $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0$.

Lemma 1. *For any $r_Q \in \mathcal{R}$, there is a $r_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0$ such that $r_Q \subseteq r_{i,j}$.*

Proof. We can rewrite the definition of r_Q as follows. Let Y be the set of tuples $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ with $1 \leq i < j \leq m$ and $d_F(Q, P[t_i, t_j]) \leq \Delta$. We have that $r_Q = \bigcup_{(i,j) \in Y} [i, j] \cap \mathbb{N}$. Let $(i, j), (i', j') \in Y$. Using the triangle inequality, we can bound $d_F(P[t_{i'}, t_{j'}], \mu_\ell(P[t_i, t_j]))$ by

$$d_F(P[t_{i'}, t_{j'}], Q) + d_F(Q, P[t_i, t_j]) + d_F(P[t_i, t_j], \mu_\ell(P[t_i, t_j])) \leq 3\Delta.$$

By the definition of $r_{i,j}$, we have $[i', j'] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq r_{i,j}$ and therefore $r_Q \subseteq r_{i,j}$. In other words, we can choose any maximal set of covered intervals within r_Q and use the simplification of the corresponding subcurve of P to find a set of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0$ that includes r_Q . \square

Greedy set cover. The well-known greedy set cover algorithm yields an $O(\log m)$ approximation for a ground set of size m [11]. The algorithm works as follows: It incrementally builds a set cover by taking the set with the largest number of still uncovered elements in each step. We state the result in the general form by using a set system oracle that allows for any $r \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0$ to test if $z \in r$. Let $T_P(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0)$ denote the preprocessing time to build the oracle and let $T_Q(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0)$ denote the time needed to answer the query. Using this, we can apply the greedy set cover algorithm to the set system $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0$. From the resulting set cover we obtain a set C consisting of ℓ -simplifications $\mu_\ell(P[t_i, t_j])$ for each $r_{i,j}$, such that $\phi(P, C) \leq 3\Delta$. We obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let $P : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a polygonal curve with breakpoints $0 \leq t_1, \dots, t_m \leq 1$. Assume there exists a set C of size k , such that $\phi(P, C) \leq \Delta$. There exists an algorithm that computes a set $C' \subset \mathbb{X}_\ell^d$ of size $O(k \log m)$ and has running time in $O(m^3 T_Q(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0) + T_P(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0))$ such that $\phi(P, C') \leq 3\Delta$.*

Proof. We use the greedy set cover algorithm on $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0$. To this end, we build the oracle for the set system in $T_P(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0)$ time. Using the oracle we can compute a incidence structure of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0$ as a binary matrix of size m^3 in $O(m^3 T_Q(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0))$ time.

We initially scan the incidence matrix to compute the number of uncovered elements $n_{i,j}$ for every range $r_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0$. After this, we can compute the set with the highest number of uncovered elements in $O(m^2)$ time.

Then, we can update all $n_{i,j}$ on the fly every time we select a new set for the set cover. To do so, we scan for each newly covered element all the m^2 entries of the incidence matrix corresponding to this element and reduce $n_{i,j}$ by 1 if the entry corresponding to $r_{i,j}$ is equal to 1. Since each of the m elements gets covered for the first time only once, this can be done in a total time of $O(m^3)$. Building the incidence matrix dominates the running time of the algorithm. The entire set cover can be computed in $O(m^3 T_Q(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0) + T_P(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0))$.

It remains to argue that we can obtain a good solution to our clustering problem. The set of center curves C corresponds to a set cover of \mathcal{R} of size k . By Lemma 1 this implies that there exists a set cover of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0$ of size k . With the approximation guarantee of [11], we get that the set cover S computed by the greedy algorithm is of size $O(k \log(m))$. Let

$$C' = \{\mu_\ell(P[t_i, t_j]) \mid r_{i,j} \in S\}.$$

Since S is a set cover for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0$, and by the definition of $r_{i,j}$, we have $\phi(P, C') \leq 3\Delta$. \square

To obtain the first result stated in Table 1 we apply Theorem 2 as follows. We simply compute the binary incidence matrix of the set system explicitly in $O(m^3(n\ell + m) + m^2 T_S(n, \ell))$ time. The query time for the set system oracle is constant (looking up an entry of the incidence matrix). Therefore, the computation of the incidence matrix dominates the running time.

In order to compute the incidence matrix M , we proceed as follows. Initially all entries of the matrix are set to 0. In the first step we compute the $O(m^2)$ simplifications $\mu_\ell(P[t_i, t_j])$ of all subcurves between two breakpoints. For each simplification μ , we compute the Δ -free space with the curve P , which is defined as the level set

$$FD_\delta(P, \mu) = \{(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 \mid \|P(x) - \mu(y)\| \leq \delta\}.$$

Computing the associated diagram can be done in $O(n\ell)$ time and space [3]. Note that the simplification μ corresponds to the vertical axis of the Δ -free space diagram and P corresponds to the horizontal axis. Now, for each breakpoint $t_{i'}$ we compute the maximal breakpoint $t_{j'}$ that is reachable by a monotone path from the bottom of the diagram at $(t_{i'}, 0)$ to the top of the diagram at $(t_{j'}, 1)$. This can be done in $O(n\ell)$ time using standard techniques [3]. For all $i' \leq q < j'$, we set the entry corresponding to q and μ to 1. This takes $O(m)$ time. We do this for all simplifications. After that, each entry of M is 1 if the corresponding element is contained in the set and 0 otherwise. Now, Theorem 2 implies the following.

Theorem 3. *Given a polygonal curve $P : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with breakpoints $0 \leq t_1, \dots, t_m \leq 1$. Assume there exists a set H^* of size k , such that $\phi(P, H^*) \leq \Delta$. Let $T_S(n, \ell)$ be the running time to compute a ℓ -simplification of a curve of $P[t_i, t_j]$ for any $0 \leq i < j \leq 1$. There exists an algorithm that computes a set $H \subset \mathbb{X}_\ell^d$ of size $O(k \log m)$ in running time of $O(m^3 n \ell + m^4 + m^2 T_S(n, \ell))$ such that $\phi(P, H) \leq 3\Delta$.*

4.1 Another set system oracle for greedy set cover

We now describe how to obtain Theorem 5, the second result stated in Table 1. Again, we use Theorem 2. The idea is to compute the incidence matrix for a slightly modified set system which approximates the set system $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_0$. This comes with an additional constant factor in the approximation of the clustering cost. The approach uses a data structure by Driemel and Har-Peled [13] for the curve P that can approximate the Fréchet-distance of any subcurve of P to a query curve Q based on the complexity of P and Q .

Theorem 4 ([13]). *Given a polygonal curve P with n edges, we can preprocess it in $O(n \log^3(n))$ time and $O(n \log(n))$ space, such that, given a query specified by*

- (i) *a pair of points u and v on the curve P ,*
 - (ii) *the edges containing these two points, and*
 - (iii) *a query curve Q with l segments,*
- one can approximate $d_F(Q, P[u, v])$ up to a constant factor in time in*

$$O(l^2 \log(n) \log(l \log(n)))$$

This means that we can approximate the distance $d_F(P[t_{i'}, t_{j'}], \mu_\ell(P[t_i, t_j]))$ for any tuple (i, i', j, j') in $O(l^2 \log(n) \log(l \log(n)))$ time after preprocessing the curve P in $O(n \log^3(n))$ time. Let c be the approximation factor of this constant approximation. With the preprocessed curve P , we can build an oracle for the set system $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_1$ analogous to the naive implementation in consisting of sets of the form

$$\tilde{r}_{i,j} = \{z \in \{1, \dots, m-1\} \mid \exists i' \leq z < j' \text{ with } \tilde{d}_F(P[t_{i'}, t_{j'}], \mu_\ell(P[t_i, t_j])) \leq 3c\Delta\},$$

where \tilde{d}_F is the approximate Fréchet-distance computed with the data structure used in Theorem 4. To do so, we compute the incidence matrix of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_1$ explicitly using $O(m^4)$ queries in total. This can be done in $O(m^4 l^2 \log(n) \log(l \log(n)))$ time after preprocessing the curve P and computing the ℓ -simplifications. Therefore we can construct the data structure of an oracle with constant query time in a total time $T_P(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_1)$ of $O(m^4 l^2 \log(n) \log(l \log(n)) + n \log^3(n))$. Since the oracle is constructed for the modified set system $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_1$ we get the following result for our clustering problem.

Theorem 5. *Given a polygonal curve $P : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with breakpoints $0 \leq t_1, \dots, t_m \leq 1$. Assume there exists a set H^* of size k , such that $\phi(P, H^*) \leq \Delta$. Let $T_S(n, \ell)$ be the running time to compute a ℓ -simplification of a curve of $P[t_i, t_j]$ for any $0 \leq i < j \leq 1$. There exists an algorithm that computes a set $H \subset \mathbb{X}_\ell^d$ of size $O(k \log m)$ in running time of $O(m^4 l^2 \log(n) \log(l \log(n)) + n \log^3(n) + m^2 T_S(n, \ell))$ such that $\phi(P, H) \leq 3c\Delta$ for some constant c .*

Proof. The running time result follows directly by the proof of Theorem 2. It remains to show the correctness of the approximation factors. Note that for $r_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_1$ we have $r_{i,j} \subseteq \tilde{r}_{i,j}$. Therefore by Lemma 1, there exists a set cover of size k of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_1$. So the set cover S computed by the greedy algorithm is of size $O(k \log(m))$. Further we get for the set

$$H = \{\mu_\ell(P[t_i, t_j]) \mid \tilde{r}_{i,j} \in S\}.$$

that $\phi(P, H) \leq 3c\Delta$. This follows directly from the definition of $\tilde{r}_{i,j}$. \square

5 A faster algorithm

In this section, we show how to apply the set cover algorithm by Brönniman and Goodrich [4] to our problem to obtain a more efficient approximation algorithm. This algorithm allows us to find an approximate set cover without computing the set system explicitly. The crucial step is a careful definition of a set system for approximation which allows for an efficient implementation of a set system oracle. For the sake of exposition we assume in this section that cluster centers are restricted to be line segments (the case $\ell = 2$). The general case ($\ell \geq 2$) is discussed in Section 6.

5.1 The set cover algorithm

The following theorem can be proven through the adaptation of a proof by Brönniman and Goodrich [4]. The theorem assumes a set system oracle for a given set system \mathcal{R} that allows for any $r \in \mathcal{R}$ to test if $z \in r$. Let $T_P(\mathcal{R})$ denote the preprocessing time to build a data structure for the oracle and let $T_Q(\mathcal{R})$ denote the time needed to answer the query $z \in r$. Let further $S_O(\mathcal{R})$ be the space required for the data structure of the oracle. We get the following:

Theorem 6. *For a given finite set system (X, \mathcal{R}) assume there exists a set cover of size k . Then, there exists an algorithm that computes a set cover of size $O(\delta k \log \delta k)$ with $\delta = \log(|X|)$ in*

$$O\left(k \log\left(\frac{|\mathcal{R}|}{k}\right) T_Q(\mathcal{R}) (|X| k \log(|X| k) \log(\log(|X|)) + |\mathcal{R}|) + T_P(\mathcal{R})\right).$$

expected running time and $O(|\mathcal{R}| + S_O(\mathcal{R}))$ space.

The proof of this theorem is independent of our main contribution, as well as being fairly technical, so we defer the proof to Section 7 after discussing the application of it here. We will use the theorem with $|\mathcal{R}| \leq m^2$ and $|X| = m$.




Figure 2: Example of a curve P and index z , such that $z \in r_{i,j}$ for some $r_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$. Also shown is a line segment Q , such that $z \in r_Q$ of the initial set system \mathcal{R} . After preprocessing, we can test $z \in r_{i,j}$ in constant time.

5.2 The set system

We start by defining the set system $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$ with ground set $Z = \{1, \dots, m-1\}$. Denote $\tau_{i,j} = \overline{P(t_i)P(t_j)}$. For a subsequence $S = s_1, \dots, s_r$ of $1, \dots, m$, denote

$$\pi(S) = \tau_{s_1, s_2} \oplus \tau_{s_2, s_3} \oplus \dots \oplus \tau_{s_{r-1}, s_r}.$$

A tuple (i, j) with $1 \leq i \leq j \leq m$ defines a set $r_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$ as follows

$$r_{i,j} = \{z \in Z \mid \exists x \in [x_z, z], y \in [z+1, y_z] \text{ with } d_F(\pi(x, z, z+1, y), \tau_{i,j}) \leq 2\Delta\},$$

where $x_z \leq z < y_z$ are indices which we obtain as follows. We scan breakpoints starting from z in the backwards order along the curve and to test for each breakpoint x , whether

$$d_F(\tau_{x,z}, P[t_x, t_z]) \leq 4\Delta. \quad (2)$$

If x satisfies (2), then we decrement x and continue the scan. If $x = 0$ or if x does not satisfy (2), then we set $x_z = x + 1$ and stop the scan. To set y_z we use a similar approach: We scan forwards from $z + 1$ along the curve and test for each breakpoint y the same property with $\tau_{z+1,y}$ and $P[t_{z+1}, t_y]$. If y satisfies the property, we increment y and continue the scan. If $y = m + 1$ or if y does not satisfy the property we set $y_z = y - 1$ and stop the scan. Figure 2 shows an example of z, x_z and y_z .

5.3 Analysis of the approximation error

In this section we show how we use a set cover of the set system $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$ to construct an approximate solution for our clustering problem and analyse the resulting approximation error. In particular, we prove Lemma 7 and Lemma 8.

Lemma 7. *Assume there exists a set cover for \mathcal{R} with parameter Δ . Let S be a set cover of size k for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$. We can derive from S a set of k cluster centers $C \subseteq \mathbb{X}_2^d$ and such that $\phi(P, C) \leq 6\Delta$.*

Proof. We set $C = \{c_{i,j} \mid r_{i,j} \in S\}$. Let $r_{i,j} \in S$ and let $z \in r_{i,j}$. By the definition of $r_{i,j}$ there are $x \in [x_z, z]$ and $y \in [z+1, y_z]$ such that $d_F(\pi(x, z, z+1, y), \tau_{i,j}) \leq 2\Delta$. In the following we show that $d_F(\tau_{i,j}, P[t_x, t_y]) \leq 6\Delta$. With the triangle inequality we get that $d_F(\tau_{i,j}, P[t_x, t_y])$ is at most the sum of

$$d_F(\tau_{i,j}, \pi(x, z, z+1, y))$$

and

$$\max(d_F(\tau_{x,z}, P[t_x, t_z]), d_F(\tau_{z,z+1}, P[t_z, t_{z+1}]), d_F(\tau_{z+1,y}, P[t_{z+1}, t_y]))$$

By the choice of x and y we have that

$$\max(d_F(\tau_{x,z}, P[t_x, t_z]), d_F(\tau_{z+1,y}, P[t_{z+1}, t_y])) \leq 4\Delta$$

It remains to show that $d_F(\tau_{z,z+1}, P[t_z, t_{z+1}]) \leq 4\Delta$. Since there exists a set cover of \mathcal{R} with parameter Δ , there exists a curve $Q \in \mathbb{X}_2^d$ and $1 \leq i' \leq z \leq z+1 \leq j' \leq m$ such that $d_F(Q, P[t_{i'}, t_{j'}]) \leq \Delta$. Therefore there exists $[a, b] \subseteq [0, 1]$ such that $d_F(Q[a, b], P[t_z, t_{z+1}]) \leq \Delta$. Because shortcutting cannot increase the Fréchet distance, we also have $d_F(Q[a, b], \tau_{z,z+1}) \leq \Delta$. By triangle inequality it now follows

$$d_F(\tau_{z,z+1}, P[t_z, t_{z+1}]) \leq d_F(\tau_{z,z+1}, Q[a, b]) + d_F(Q[a, b], P[t_z, t_{z+1}]) \leq 2\Delta$$

Since S is a set cover, it holds for the ground set Z , that $Z = \bigcup_{(i,j) \in S} r_{i,j}$. Therefore, if we choose $C = \{c_{i,j} \mid r_{i,j} \in S\}$, then $\phi(P, C) \leq 6\Delta$. \square

Lemma 8. *If there exists a set cover S of \mathcal{R} , then there exists a set cover of the same size for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$.*

To prove this lemma, we first prove the following simple lemma.

Lemma 9. *Let $1 \leq i' \leq i \leq j \leq j' \leq m$ be indices. If $d_F(\tau_{i',j'}, P[t_{i'}, t_{j'}]) \leq \alpha$, then $d_F(\tau_{i,j}, P[t_i, t_j]) \leq 2\alpha$.*

Proof. There exists a line segment $\tau' \subseteq \tau_{i',j'}$, such that $d_F(\tau', P[t_i, t_j]) \leq \alpha$. Since shortcutting cannot increase the Fréchet distance to a line segment, we also have $d_F(\tau', \tau_{i,j}) \leq \alpha$. By triangle inequality it now follows that

$$d_F(\tau_{i,j}, P[t_i, t_j]) \leq d_F(\tau_{i,j}, \tau') + d_F(\tau', P[t_i, t_j]) \leq 2\alpha.$$

\square

Corollary 10. *The indices x_z and y_z have the following properties*

- (i) $\forall x \in [x_z, z] : d_F(\tau_{x,z}, P[t_x, t_z]) \leq 4\Delta$ and $\forall y \in [z+1, y_z] : d_F(\tau_{z,y}, P[t_z, t_y]) \leq 4\Delta$
- (ii) $\forall x \in [1, x_z] : d_F(\tau_{x,z}, P[t_x, t_z]) > 2\Delta$ and $\forall y \in (y_z, m] : d_F(\tau_{z,y}, P[t_z, t_y]) > 2\Delta$

Proof of Lemma 8. We claim that for any set $r_Q \in \mathcal{R}$ there exists a set $r \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$, such that $r_Q \subseteq r$. This claim implies the lemma statement. It remains to prove the claim.

We can rewrite the definition of r_Q . Let Y be the set of tuples $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ with $1 \leq i < j \leq m$ and $d_F(Q, P[t_i, t_j]) \leq \Delta$. We have that $r_Q = \bigcup_{(i,j) \in Y} [i, j] \cap \mathbb{N}$.

Let $(i, j) \in Y$. We show that $r_Q \subseteq r_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$. Let $z \in r_Q$. By the definition of r_Q we have

$$\exists x \leq z < y \text{ s.t. } d_F(Q, P[t_x, t_y]) \leq \Delta$$

To show that $z \in r_{i,j}$, we prove that the following two conditions hold:

- (i) $x \in [x_z, z]$ and $y \in [z+1, y_z]$,
- (ii) $d_F(\pi(x, z, z+1, y), \tau_{i,j}) \leq 2\Delta$.

Since $d_F(Q, P[t_x, t_y]) \leq \Delta$ and shortcutting cannot increase the Fréchet-distance to a line segment we also have

$$d_F(Q, \pi(x, z, z+1, y)) \leq \Delta$$

Similarly, we can conclude $d_F(Q, \tau_{i,j}) \leq \Delta$. It now follows from the triangle inequality, that

$$d_F(\pi(x, z, z+1, y), \tau_{i,j}) \leq d_F(\pi(x, z, z+1, y), Q) + d_F(Q, \tau_{i,j}) \leq 2\Delta.$$

This implies condition (ii).

The first condition (i) follows in a similar way. Since $r_Q \in S$, there exists a line segment $q_x \subseteq Q$, such that $d_F(q_x, P[t_x, t_z]) \leq \Delta$. Applying again that shortcutting cannot increase the Fréchet-distance to a line segment we also get $d_F(q_x, \tau_{x,z}) \leq \Delta$. By the triangle inequality, we have

$$d_F(\tau_{x,z}, P[t_x, t_z]) \leq d_F(\tau_{x,z}, q_x) + d_F(q_x, P[t_x, t_z]) \leq 2\Delta.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 9, for all $x' \in [x, z]$ $d_F(\tau_{x',z}, P[t_{x'}, t_z]) \leq 4\Delta$. As such, x is encountered in the scan and ends up being contained in the interval $[x_z, z]$.

We can make a symmetric argument to show $d_F(\tau_{z+1,y}, P[t_{z+1}, t_y])$ and conclude using Lemma 9 that $y \in [z+1, y_z]$. This proves condition (i).

Together, the above implies that $z \in r_{i,j}$ for $r_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$. Therefore $r_Q \subseteq r_{i,j}$ for some $r_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$. \square

5.4 The algorithm

We intend to use the algorithm of Theorem 6 to find a set cover of the set system $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$, since such a set cover gives a 6-approximation for our clustering problem; see Section 7 for details on the algorithm. The algorithm requires a set system oracle for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$. In this section we describe such a set system oracle. In particular, we show how to build a data structure that answers a query, given indices i, j and z , for the predicate $z \in r_{i,j}$ in $O(1)$ time.

The data structure. To build the data structure for the oracle, we first compute the indices x_z and y_z for each $1 \leq z \leq m-1$, as specified in the definition of the set system in Section 5.2. Next, we construct a data structure that can answer for a pair of breakpoints i and z if there is a breakpoint x with $x_z \leq x \leq z$ such that $\|P(t_x) - P(t_i)\| \leq 2\Delta$ in $O(1)$ time. For this we build an $m \times m$ matrix M in the following way. For each breakpoint i we go through the sorted list of breakpoints and check if $\|P(t_i) - P(t_j)\| \leq 2\Delta$ for each $1 \leq j \leq m$. While doing that, we determine for each j which is the first breakpoint $z_{i,j} \geq j$ with $\|P(t_i) - P(t_{z_{i,j}})\| \leq 2\Delta$. The entries $z_{i,j}$ are then stored in the matrix M at position $M(i, j)$. Given the Matrix M the oracle can answer if there is a breakpoint x with $x_z \leq x \leq z$ such that $\|P(t_x) - P(t_i)\| \leq 2\Delta$ by checking if $M(i, x_z) \leq z$. The data structure can also answer if there is a breakpoint y with $z+1 \leq y \leq y_z$ such that $\|P(t_y) - P(t_j)\| \leq 2\Delta$ by checking if $M(j, z+1) \leq y_z$. The final data structure stores the matrix M only.

The query. We answer queries as follows. Given z, i and j , we want to determine if $z \in r_{i,j}$. We return “yes”, if the following three conditions are satisfied: (i) $M(i, x_z) \leq z$ (ii) $M(j, z+1) \leq y_z$ (iii) $\|s - P(t_z)\| \leq 2\Delta$, where s is the intersection of the bisector between the points $P(t_z)$ and $P(t_{z+1})$ and the line segment $\tau_{i,j}$. Otherwise, the algorithm returns “no”.

Correctness. The above described set system oracle returns the correct answer, which is implied by the following lemma.

Lemma 11. $d_F(\pi(x, z, z+1, y), \tau_{i,j}) \leq 2\Delta$ if and only if the following three conditions are satisfied:

- (i) $\|P(t_x) - u\| \leq 2\Delta$
 - (ii) $\|P(t_y) - v\| \leq 2\Delta$
 - (iii) $\min_{\lambda, \lambda' \in [0,1]} (\|a - (\lambda v + (1-\lambda)u)\|, \|b - (\lambda' v + (1-\lambda')u)\|) \leq 2\Delta$
- where $a = P(t_z)$, $b = P(t_{z+1})$, $u = P(t_i)$, and $v = P(t_j)$.

Proof. The Fréchet distance of two line segments is attained at their starting points or end points. Condition (iii) can be tested in constant time. Therefore the test $z \in r_{i,j}$ can be done in $O(1)$ time after creating the matrix M with the data structure that we described above. See also Figure 3. \square




Figure 3: Illustration to Lemma 11. The figure on the right shows the 2Δ -free-space diagram of the two curves on the left. A monotone path is feasible iff the three conditions are satisfied. Using this lemma we prove that the query $z \in r_{i,j}$ can be answered in $O(1)$ time (after preprocessing).

Running time. Next, we analyse the running time of constructing an oracle for the case $\ell = 2$ and query time $O(1)$. In particular we analyse the running time of the scan for the indices x_z (or y_z) with $1 \leq z < m$ and the running time for building the matrix M .

As described above the index-scan for x_z , given z , can be done by checking for breakpoints $x \in \{z - 1, \dots, 1\}$ in backwards order from z if $d_F(\tau_{x,z}, P[t_x, t_z]) \leq 4\Delta$. Since $\tau_{x,z}$ has complexity 2 and $P[t_x, t_z]$ has complexity at most n , the check $d_F(\tau_{x,z}, P[t_x, t_z]) \leq 4\Delta$ can be done in $O(n)$ time and $O(n)$ space for any $x, z \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ using standard methods [3]. The scan for y_z is analogous, so we need a total time of $O(m^2n)$ to scan for all indices.

For building the matrix M , the algorithm computes the Euclidean distances of all $\binom{m}{2}$ pairs of breakpoints and while doing that records for each breakpoint t_j the smallest index of a breakpoint after t_j that lies within distance 2Δ to this breakpoint. In total, this it takes $O(m^2)$ time. Together with the scan for the indices we get the following runtime for building the oracle.

Theorem 12. *One can build a data structure of size $O(m^2)$ in time $O(m^2n)$ and space $O(n + m^2)$ that answers for an element of the ground set Z and a set of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$, whether this element is contained in the set in $O(1)$ time.*

5.5 The result

For the set system $(Z, \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2)$, we have $|Z| = m$ and $|\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2| = O(m^2)$. We combine this with the result for constructing the oracle in Theorem 12 and apply Theorem 6 to get the following result on computing set covers of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$.

Theorem 13. *Let k be the minimum size of a set cover for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$. There exists an algorithm that computes a set cover for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$ of size $O(k \log(m) \log(\log(m)k))$ in expected running time of*

$$O\left(mk \log\left(\frac{m}{k}\right)(k \log(m) \log(k \log(m)) + m) + m^2n\right)$$

and $O(n + m^2)$ space.

As a direct consequence we get the following result for our clustering problem in the case $\ell = 2$ with the help of Lemma 7 and Lemma 8.

Theorem 14. *Let $P : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a polygonal curve of complexity n with breakpoints $0 \leq t_1, \dots, t_m \leq 1$ and let $\ell = 2$. Assume there exists a set $C^* \subset \mathbb{X}_2^d$ of size k , such that $\phi(P, C^*) \leq \Delta$. There exists an*




Figure 4: Example of the generated $(4\Delta, 2\ell)$ -simplifications for a curve P with breakpoints $z, z+1, y_1, y_2$ and y_{z+1} in the case $\ell = 2$.

algorithm that computes a set $C \subset \mathbb{X}_2^d$ of size $O(k \log(m) \log(\log(m)k))$ in

$$O\left(mk \log\left(\frac{m}{k}\right)(k \log(m) \log(k \log(m)) + m) + m^2 n\right)$$

expected running time and $O(n + m^2)$ space such that $\phi(P, C) \leq 6\Delta$.

6 The general case

In this section we extend the scheme described in Section 5 to the case $\ell > 2$. Again, the crucial step is a careful definition of a set system for approximation which allows for an efficient implementation of a set system oracle. The main idea is to replace the edges of the proxy curve π from Section 5 by simplifications of the corresponding subcurves. We show that we can do this in a way that ensures that these simplifications are nested in a certain way. This in turn will allow us to build efficient data structures for this set system.

6.1 Simplifications

We begin by introducing the following slightly different notion of simplification. A curve $Q \in \mathbb{X}_\ell^d$ is an (ϵ, ℓ) -**simplification** of a curve P if its Fréchet distance to P is at most ϵ . We call the simplification **vertex-restricted** if $V(Q) \subseteq V(P)$ and the vertices of Q have the same order as in P . In this context we say that a point p of P **corresponds** to an edge e of a vertex-restricted simplification of P if it lies in between the two endpoints of e in P . The main purpose of this section is to define simplifications $\sigma^+(i, j)$, $\sigma^-(i, j)$ and $\sigma^o(i, i+1)$ for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ that we will use in the definition of the set system in the next section. Concretely, the simplifications will be defined as the output of the algorithm by Agarwal et. al. [2]. In a nutshell, their algorithm works the following way: Let $\kappa(\frac{\epsilon}{2})$ denote the minimum number of vertices in a vertex-restricted $(\frac{\epsilon}{2}, n)$ -simplification of a curve P with vertices p_1, \dots, p_n . To compute a vertex-restricted $(\epsilon, \kappa(\frac{\epsilon}{2}))$ -simplification P' of the curve P , the algorithm iteratively adds new vertices to the simplification starting with the first vertex p_1 of the curve. In each step it takes the last vertex p_i of the simplification and determines with an exponential search the last integer $j \geq 0$ such that $d_F(\overline{p_i p_{i+2^j}}, P[p_i, p_{i+2^j}]) \leq \epsilon$. After determining j it finds with a binary search the last integer $r \in [2^j, 2^{j+1}]$ such that $d_F(\overline{p_i p_{i+r}}, P[p_i, p_{i+r}]) \leq \epsilon$. The algorithm terminates when it reaches p_n .

Generating simplifications. We now describe how to generate a set of simplifications that will be used in the definition of our set system in Section 6.2. We apply the above described algorithm on subcurves of P in the following way: For the parameterization $P: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ of P where $P(t_i)$ gives the i -th breakpoint of P let $0 = s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_n = 1$ be the values such that $P(s_j) = p_j$. For each $z \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ we apply the algorithm with $\epsilon = 4\Delta$ on $P[t_z, 1]$ to get a simplification P_z^+ . We stop the algorithm early if the complexity of the simplification reaches 2ℓ . If $|P'| = 2\ell$ let $P(s_{z_{2\ell}})$ be the 2ℓ -th vertex of P_z^+ . Otherwise set $P(s_{z_{2\ell}}) = p_n$.

Let y_z be the last breakpoint of P before $P(s_{z_{2\ell}})$. Let $z \leq y \leq y_z$. Since P_z^+ is a $(4\Delta, 2\ell)$ -simplification of $P[t_z, 1]$, there exists a subcurve $\sigma^+(z, y)$ of P_z^+ such that $d_F(\sigma^+(z, y), P[t_z, t_y]) \leq 4\Delta$. From each possible subcurve with the above property let more specifically $\sigma^+(z, y)$ be the longest subcurve that does not contain any vertex $P(s_i)$ with $s_i \geq t_y$. This subcurve $\sigma^+(z, y)$ is therefore a uniquely defined $(4\Delta, 2\ell)$ -simplification of $P[t_z, t_y]$ that ends in a point of the edge of P_z^+ corresponding to $P(t_y)$. Analogously we generate the curve $\sigma^\circ(z, z+1)$ by running the algorithm for the curve $P[t_z, t_{z+1}]$ and the $\sigma^-(x, z)$ by running the algorithm for the direction-inverted curve $P[t_z, 0]$. That is the curve $Q : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with $Q(t) = P((1-t)t_z)$. Note that it is possible that the algorithm does not find a simplification at all for a specific subcurve. In this case we say the simplification is empty (and we denote this with \perp). See also Figure 4 for an example of the generated simplifications.

We summarize crucial properties of the generated simplifications in the following two lemmata. These properties will help to construct an efficient oracle for our set system later.

Lemma 15. *Let $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ with $i < j$. The curve $\sigma^+(i, j)$ is either a uniquely defined $(4\Delta, 2\ell)$ -simplification of $P[t_z, t_y]$, or it is $\sigma^+(i, j) = \perp$. In the latter case there exists no $Q \in \mathbb{X}_l^d$ such that $d_F(Q, P[t_i, t_j]) \leq \Delta$. Moreover, for any non-empty simplification $\sigma^+(i, j)$ and for any $i < j' < j$, the simplification $\sigma^+(i, j')$ is non-empty and is a subcurve of $\sigma^+(i, j)$.*

We get symmetric lemmas for the other simplifications. We will see in the next section why it is convenient to have these properties in both directions, forwards and backwards along the curve.

Lemma 16. *Let $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ with $i < j$. The curve $\sigma^-(i, j)$ is either a uniquely defined $(4\Delta, 2\ell)$ -simplification of $P[t_z, t_y]$, or it is $\sigma^-(i, j) = \perp$. In the latter case there exists no $Q \in \mathbb{X}_l^d$ such that $d_F(Q, P[t_i, t_j]) \leq \Delta$. Moreover, for any non-empty simplification $\sigma^-(i, j)$ and for any $i < i' < j$ it holds that the simplification $\sigma^-(i', j)$ is non-empty and is a subcurve of $\sigma^-(i, j)$.*

Lemma 17. *Let $z \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$. The curve $\sigma^\circ(z, z+1)$ is either a uniquely defined $(4\Delta, 2\ell)$ -simplification of $P[t_z, t_{z+1}]$, or it is $\sigma^\circ(z, z+1) = \perp$. In the latter case there exists no $Q \in \mathbb{X}_l^d$ such that $d_F(Q, P[t_i, t_j]) \leq \Delta$.*

Lemma 15 follows directly from the following lemma. Lemma 16 and Lemma 17 follow by using symmetric arguments.

Lemma 18. *Consider the generating process described in Section 6.1. Let y be a breakpoint of P with $t_y > s_{z_{2\ell}}$. There exists no $Q \in \mathbb{X}_l^d$ such that $d_F(Q, P[t_z, t_y]) \leq \Delta$.*

Proof. Let $1 \leq v \leq n$ such that $s_{v-1} \leq t_y \leq s_v$. So $P(s_v)$ is the first vertex of P after the breakpoint y . Assume there exists a $Q \in \mathbb{X}_l^d$ such that $d_F(Q, P[t_z, t_y]) \leq \Delta$.

To get a contradiction we will show that, with this assumption, we can construct a vertex-restricted $(2\Delta, 2\ell - 1)$ -simplification of $P[t_z, s_v]$. Let $\kappa(2\Delta)$ denote the minimum number of vertices in a vertex-restricted $(2\Delta, n)$ -simplification of $P[t_z, s_v]$. Note that $v > z_{2\ell}$. So the vertex-restricted $(4\Delta, \kappa(2\Delta))$ -simplification P' of the subcurve $P[t_z, s_v]$ computed with the algorithm of Agarwal et. al. has a complexity of at least $2\ell + 1$. This follows by the definition of $P(s_{z_{2\ell}})$. Therefore we have $\kappa(2\Delta) \geq 2\ell + 1$. But our constructed vertex-restricted $(2\Delta, 2\ell - 1)$ -simplification then would directly contradict $\kappa(2\Delta) \geq 2\ell + 1$.

For the construction of the $(2\Delta, 2\ell - 1)$ -simplification let $\tilde{P} = P[t_z, s_{v-1}]$. Since Q is a (Δ, ℓ) -simplification of $P[t_z, t_y]$, there exists a subcurve \tilde{Q} of Q with $d_F(\tilde{Q}, \tilde{P}) \leq \Delta$. Let e_1, \dots, e_k be the edges of \tilde{Q} and $\tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_j$ be the vertices of \tilde{P} . It is $k \leq l - 1$ and $j \leq n$. Let γ be a strictly monotone increasing function such that

$$d_F(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}) = \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \|\tilde{P}(t) - \tilde{Q}(\gamma(t))\| \leq \Delta.$$

Let further

$$t_{i_1} = \min\{t \in [0, 1] \mid \tilde{Q}(\gamma(t)) \in e_i, \tilde{P}(t) \in \{\tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_j\}\}$$

be the first vertex of \tilde{P} that gets mapped to e_i and

$$t_{i_2} = \max\{t \in [0, 1] \mid \tilde{Q}(\gamma(t)) \in e_i, \tilde{P}(t) \in \{\tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_j\}\}$$

be the last vertex of \tilde{P} that gets mapped to e_i . By construction we have

$$d_F(\overline{\tilde{P}(t_{i_1})\tilde{P}(t_{i_2})}, \overline{\tilde{Q}(\gamma(t_{i_1}))\tilde{Q}(\gamma(t_{i_2}))}) \leq \Delta$$

and therefore with the use of triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & d_F(\overline{\tilde{P}(t_{i_1})\tilde{P}(t_{i_2})}, \tilde{P}[t_{i_1}, t_{i_2}]) \\ & \leq d_F(\overline{\tilde{P}(t_{i_1})\tilde{P}(t_{i_2})}, \overline{\tilde{Q}(\gamma(t_{i_1}))\tilde{Q}(\gamma(t_{i_2}))}) + d_F(\overline{\tilde{Q}(\gamma(t_{i_1}))\tilde{Q}(\gamma(t_{i_2}))}, \tilde{P}[t_{i_1}, t_{i_2}]) \\ & \leq \Delta + \Delta \\ & = 2\Delta \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{P}(t_{i_2})$ and $\tilde{P}(t_{(i+1)_1})$ are consecutive vertices of \tilde{P} , we also have

$$d_F(\overline{\tilde{P}(t_{i_2})\tilde{P}(t_{(i+1)_1})}, \tilde{P}[t_{i_2}, t_{(i+1)_1}]) = 0.$$

So we can construct a $(2\Delta, 2\ell - 1)$ -simplification of $P[t_z, s_v]$ by concatenating the vertices

$$\tilde{P}(t_{1_1}), \tilde{P}(t_{1_2}), \tilde{P}(t_{2_1}), \tilde{P}(t_{2_2}), \dots, \tilde{P}(t_{k_1}), \tilde{P}(t_{k_2}), P(s_v).$$

To see that the resulting curve is indeed a vertex-restricted simplification, we observe that $\tilde{P}(t_{1_1}) = \tilde{P}(0) = P(t_z)$ and that the edge from $\tilde{P}(t_{k_2}) = P(s_{v-1})$ to $P(s_v)$ is entirely included in P . \square

6.2 The set system

We are now ready to define the new set system $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_3$ with ground set $Z = \{1, \dots, m-1\}$. The set system depends on the simplifications of subcurves of P defined in the previous section. Let (i, j) be a tuple with $1 \leq i \leq j \leq m$. We say $r_{i,j} = \emptyset$ if there is no $Q \in \mathbb{X}_\ell^d$ such that $d_F(Q, P[t_i, t_j]) \leq \Delta$. Otherwise, we define a set $r_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_3$ as follows

$$r_{i,j} = \{z \in Z \mid \exists x \in [x_z, z], y \in [z+1, y_{z+1}] \text{ with } d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), \sigma^+(i, j)) \leq 10\Delta\},$$

where

$$\kappa_z(x, y) = \sigma^-(x, z) \oplus \sigma^o(z, z+1) \oplus \sigma^+(z+1, y)$$

and $x_z \leq z$ is the smallest index such that $\sigma^-(x, z) \neq \perp$ for all $x_z \leq x \leq z$ and $y_{z+1} \geq z+1$ is the highest index such that $\sigma^+(z+1, y) \neq \perp$ for all $z+1 \leq y \leq y_{z+1}$. For an example of a curve P with breakpoints z, i, j such that $z \in r_{i,j}$ see Figure 5. Note that, by Lemma 17 the curve $\sigma^o(z, z+1)$ is non-empty for all $z \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$ if there exists a set of cluster centers $C \subset \mathbb{X}_\ell^d$ such that $\Phi(P, C) \leq \Delta$. So in this case the set system is well-defined as implied by the Lemmas 15, 16 and 17.

6.3 Analysis of the approximation error

We show correctness in the same schema as in Section 5.3. In particular, we prove Lemma 19 and Lemma 20.

Lemma 19. *Let S be a set cover of size k for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_3$. We can derive from S a set of k cluster centers $C \subseteq \mathbb{X}_\ell^d$ and such that $\phi(P, C) \leq 14\Delta$.*

Proof. To construct C from S we take for each tuple $r_{i,j} \in S$ the center curve $\sigma^+(i, j)$. Let $z \in r_{i,j}$. By the definition of $r_{i,j}$ there are $x \in [x_z, z]$ and $y \in [z+1, y_z]$ such that $d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), \sigma^+(i, j)) \leq 10\Delta$. In the following we show that $d_F(\sigma^+(i, j), P[t_x, t_y]) \leq 14\Delta$. With the triangle inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} d_F(\sigma^+(i, j), P[t_x, t_y]) & \leq d_F(\sigma^+(i, j), \kappa_z(x, y)) + d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), P[t_x, t_y]) \\ & \leq 10\Delta + d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), P[t_x, t_y]) \end{aligned}$$




Figure 5: Example of a curve P such that $z \in r_{i,j}$ for some $r_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_3$. Also shown is the 10Δ -free space diagram of $\kappa_z(x, y)$ and $\sigma^+(i, j)$. Simplification $\sigma^+(i, j)$ demonstrates that the simplifications do not have to be vertex-restricted.

It remains to show that

$$d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), P[t_x, t_y]) \leq 4\Delta.$$

This follows directly because the distance $d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), P[t_x, t_y])$ is at most the maximum of the distances $d_F(\sigma^-(x, z), P[t_x, t_z])$, $d_F(\sigma^0(z, z+1), P[t_z, t_{z+1}])$ and $d_F(\sigma^+(z+1, y), P[t_{z+1}, t_y])$. We use here that $\sigma^-(x, z)$, $\sigma^0(z, z+1)$ and $\sigma^+(z+1, y)$ are $(4\Delta, 2\ell)$ -simplifications of the corresponding subcurves. Since S is a set cover, it holds for the ground set $Z = \{1, \dots, m-1\}$, that $Z = \bigcup_{(i,j) \in S} r_{i,j}$. Therefore, if we choose $C = \{\sigma^+(i, j) \mid r_{i,j} \in S\}$, we get $\phi(P, C) \leq 14\Delta$. \square

Lemma 20. *If there exists a set cover S of \mathcal{R} , then there exists a set cover of the same size for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_3$.*

Proof. We claim that for any set $r_Q \in \mathcal{R}$ there exists a set $r \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_3$, such that $r_Q \subseteq r$. This claim implies the lemma statement. It remains to prove the claim.

We can rewrite the definition of r_Q . Let Y be the set of tuples $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ with $1 \leq i < j \leq m$ and $d_F(Q, P[t_i, t_j]) \leq \Delta$. We have that $r_Q = \bigcup_{(i,j) \in Y} [i, j] \cap \mathbb{N}$.

Let $(i, j) \in Y$. We show that $r_Q \subseteq r_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_3$. Let $z \in r_Q$. By the definition of r_Q we have

$$\exists x \leq z < y \text{ s.t. } d_F(Q, P[t_x, t_y]) \leq \Delta$$

To show that $z \in r_{i,j}$, we prove that the following two conditions hold:

- (i) $x \in [x_z, z]$ and $y \in [z+1, y_z]$,
- (ii) $d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), \sigma^+(i, j)) \leq 10\Delta$.

As stated above, we have $d_F(Q, P[t_x, t_y]) \leq \Delta$. Therefore we can subdivide Q into 3 subcurves Q_x, Q_z, Q_y such that

$$\max(d_F(Q_x, P[t_x, t_z]), d_F(Q_z, P[t_z, t_{z+1}]), d_F(Q_y, P[t_{z+1}, t_y])) \leq \Delta$$

Each of the subcurves has complexity at most ℓ since Q has complexity at most ℓ . By the Lemmas 16 and 15, we have $\sigma^-(x', z) \neq \perp$ for all $x \leq x' \leq z$ and $\sigma^+(z+1, y') \neq \perp$ for all $z+1 \leq y' \leq y_{z+1}$. We can conclude that $x \in [x_z, z]$ and $y \in [z+1, y_z]$ and therefore condition (i) is fulfilled.

To prove condition (ii) we can use the triangle inequality to get

$$d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), \sigma^+(i, j)) \leq d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), Q) + d_F(Q, \sigma^+(i, j))$$

Since we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), Q) &\leq d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), P[t_x, t_y]) + d_F(P[t_x, t_y], Q) \\ &\leq 4\Delta + \Delta \\ &= 5\Delta \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} d_F(Q, \sigma^+(i, j)) &\leq d_F(Q, P[t_i, t_j]) + d_F(P[t_i, t_j], \sigma^+(i, j)) \\ &\leq \Delta + 4\Delta \\ &= 5\Delta \end{aligned}$$

we get in total

$$d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), \sigma^+(i, j)) \leq 10\Delta$$

Together, the above implies that $z \in r_{i,j}$ and therefore $r_Q \subseteq r_{i,j}$. \square

6.4 The approximation oracle

To find a set cover of the set system $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_3$ we want to use the framework described in Section 7. But to apply Theorem 6 directly we would need to implement an oracle that answers for an element of the ground set $Z = \{1, \dots, m-1\}$ and a set of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_3$, whether this element is contained in the set. In this section we describe how to answer such queries approximately. In the next section (Section 6.5) we then show how to apply Theorem 6.

The approximation oracle will have the following properties. Given a set $r_{i,j} \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_3$ and an element $z \in Z$ this approximation oracle returns either one of the following answers:

- (i) "Yes", in this case there exists $x \in [x_z, z]$ and $y \in [z+1, y_{z+1}]$ with $d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), \sigma^+(i, j)) \leq 46\Delta$
- (ii) "No", in this case $(i, j) \notin r_z$.

In both cases the answer is correct.

To construct the approximation oracle we build a data structure that answers a query, given indices i, j and z , for the predicate $z \in r_{i,j}$ in $O(\ell^2)$ time. In particular we need a data structure that can build a free space diagram of the curves $\kappa_z(x_z, y_{z+1})$ and $\sigma^+(i, j)$ to bound the distance $d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), \sigma^+(i, j))$ for every $x \in [x_z, z]$ and $y \in [z+1, y_{z+1}]$. In this context we define active edges of the simplifications $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$ and $\sigma^+(z+1, y_{z+1})$ with respect to $r_{i,j}$ since the data structure needs to be able to find these efficiently to answer the query. For the definition recall that a point of P is said to correspond to an edge e of a vertex-restricted simplification of P if it lies in between the two endpoints of e in P .

Definition 21. Let z, i, j be breakpoints of P . An edge e of the simplification $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$ is **active** with respect to $r_{i,j}$ if there is a breakpoint $x \in [x_z, z]$ corresponding to e with $d(P(t_x), P(t_i)) \leq 18\Delta$. An edge e of the simplification $\sigma^+(z+1, y_{z+1})$ is **active** with respect to $r_{i,j}$ if there is a breakpoint $y \in [z+1, y_{z+1}]$ corresponding to e with $d(P(t_y), P(t_j)) \leq 18\Delta$.

So an active edge is an edge of the simplification that contains the image of a breakpoint that is close to i or j respectively. The active edges will become relevant for answering a query since in the case that $z \in r_{i,j}$ there exist breakpoints x and y on active edges such that $d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), \sigma^+(i, j)) \leq 10\Delta$. For an approximate solution it will suffice to check the existence of a strictly monotone path in the free space diagram that start on an active edge of $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$ and end in an active edge of $\sigma^+(z+1, y_{z+1})$. The advantage is that this can be done faster than checking if $d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), \sigma^+(i, j)) \leq 10\Delta$ for each $x \in [x_z, z]$ and $y \in [z+1, y_{z+1}]$. See Figure 6 for an example.

The query. Given $z, i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ the oracle is therefore checking if $z \in r_{i,j}$ the following way:

First it builds a free space diagram of $\sigma^+(i, j)$ and $\kappa_z(x_z, y_{z+1})$ for the distance 10Δ . Then it checks for each edge on $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$ and on $\sigma^+(z+1, y_{z+1})$ if it is active. In the end, the oracle checks if there is a monotone increasing path in the 10Δ -free space that starts on an active edge of $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$ in one coordinate and $\sigma^+(i, j)(0)$ in the other coordinate and ends on an active edge of $\sigma^+(z+1, y_{z+1})$ in one coordinate and $\sigma^+(i, j)(1)$ in the other coordinate. The oracle returns "Yes" if such a path exists. See Figure 7 for an example of a "Yes" answer.

To do the above steps efficiently an underlying data structure for the oracle has to be built in the preprocessing. We will first show how the data structure is built and then prove the correctness of the oracle and analyse its running time.

The data structure. The data structure is built in two steps. The first step is to compute the simplifications. The second step consists of constructing a data structure for the breakpoints that can be used to determine active edges.

We compute the simplifications $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$, $\sigma^o(z, z+1)$ and $\sigma^+(z, y_z)$ for every breakpoint $z \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ by running the algorithm of Agarwal et. al. [2] up to complexity 2ℓ . For each edge e of $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$ and $\sigma^+(z, y_z)$, we save the first breakpoint x_e and the last breakpoint y_e that corresponds to e .

In addition to these simplifications, the oracle also needs the simplification $\sigma^+(i, j)$ to build the free space diagram. Note that $\sigma^+(i, j)$ does not need to be stored in the data structure since for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$,




Figure 6: Example of a curve P and breakpoints $x_z, x, z, z+1, y, y_{z+1}, i$ and j . The active edges are e_1, e_8 and e_9 since there are breakpoints corresponding to these edges within distance 18Δ to i or j respectively. There is, however, no strictly monotone path from e_1 on the bottom to e_8 or e_9 on the top in the 10Δ -free space of $\sigma^+(i, j)$ and $\kappa_z(x_z, y_{z+1})$. So we have $z \notin r_{i,j}$.

the simplification $\sigma^+(i, j)$ can be constructed using $\sigma^+(i, j_i)$. To do so, the oracle does binary search to find the edge e of $\sigma^+(i, j_i)$ such that j corresponds to e . Then, the oracle computes the last point of e that intersects the ball $B(t_j, 4\Delta)$. The subcurve of $\sigma^+(i, j_i)$ up to this point is $\sigma^+(i, j)$.

The oracle needs to determine which edges are active. For this we construct a data structure in the same way as described for the case $\ell = 2$ in Section 5.4. We build an $m \times m$ matrix M which stores the following information. For each breakpoint i we go through the sorted list of breakpoints and check if $d(P(t_i), P(t_j)) \leq 18\Delta$ for each $1 \leq j \leq m$. While doing that, we determine for each j which is the first breakpoint $z_{i,j} \geq j$ with $d(P(t_i), P(t_j)) \leq 18\Delta$. The entries $z_{i,j}$ are then stored in the matrix M .

Let $x_e(y_e)$ be the first (last) breakpoint corresponding to the edge e . To check if there is one breakpoint z on an edge e of a simplification such that $d(P(t_i), P(t_z)) \leq 18\Delta$ for some other breakpoint i , we only have to check if $z_{i,x_e} \geq y_e$. This is exactly what we need to check to decide if an edge is active and can be done in constant time given the matrix M .

Overall, the data structure therefore consists of $O(m)$ simplifications with pointers to the first (last) element of each edge and the matrix M of size $O(m^2)$ containing the $z_{i,j}$ -entries. This data structure is then used for each query to build a free space diagram and to find the active edges. The existence of a monotone increasing path is then tested by computing the reachability of active edges from active edges in the free space diagram. This can be done using the standard methods described by Alt and Godau [3] in the following way.

The free space diagram of the 10Δ -free space F can be divided into cells that each correspond to a pair of edges, one from each curve $\kappa_z(x_z, y_{z+1})$ and $\sigma^+(i, j)$. Let us denote with $C_{s,t}$ the cell of the free space diagram corresponding to the s -th edge of $\sigma^+(i, j)$ and the t -th edge e_t of $\kappa_z(x_z, y_{z+1})$. We further denote with $L_{s,t}$ and $B_{s,t}$ the left and bottom line segment bounding the cell $C_{s,t}$. We also define $L_{s,t}^F = L_{s,t} \cap F$ and $B_{s,t}^F = B_{s,t} \cap F$.

We need to calculate the reachable space $R \subseteq F$ where a point $p \in F$ is in R if and only if there exists an active edge e_t of $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$ such that there exists a monotone increasing path within F from $B_{1,t}^F$ to p . We further define $L_{s,t}^R = L_{s,t} \cap R$ and $B_{s,t}^R = B_{s,t} \cap R$.

Note that given $L_{s,t}^R$, $B_{s,t}^R$, $L_{s+1,t}^F$ and $B_{s,t+1}^F$, we can construct $L_{s+1,t}^R$ and $L_{s,t+1}^R$ in constant time. So, given that we know for each edge e_t of $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$, whether it is active or not, we can compute $L_{1,t}^R$ and $B_{1,t}^R$ for all edges e_t . With these we can iteratively construct all $L_{s,t}^R$ and $B_{s,t}^R$, proceeding row by row in the free space diagram.

Let $s^* \leq 2\ell$ be the number of edges of $\sigma^+(i, j)$. We get the following directly from the definition of R . If and only if there exists an active edge e_t of $\sigma^+(z+1, y_{z+1})$ such that $B_{s^*+1,t}^R \neq \emptyset$, then there is a monotone increasing path starting and ending in an active edge. So we only have to check for all active edges e_t of $\sigma^+(z+1, y_{z+1})$ if $B_{s^*+1,t}^R \neq \emptyset$.

Correctness. To show the correctness of the oracle we show the following lemma.

Lemma 22. *Let $z, i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Consider the query $z \in r_{i,j}$. If the approximation oracle returns the answer*

- (i) "Yes", then there exists $x \in [x_z, z]$ and $y \in [z+1, y_{z+1}]$ with $d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), \sigma^+(i, j)) \leq 46\Delta$
- (ii) "No", then we have $z \notin r_{i,j}$.

Proof. i) Consider the 10Δ -free space diagram of $\kappa_z(x, y)$ and $\sigma^+(i, j)$. If the oracle returns the answer "Yes" then there is a monotone increasing path in the 10Δ -free space that starts on an active edge e and ends on an active edge e' .

We show that this path implicitly gives two breakpoints $x_e \in [x_z, z]$ and $y_{e'} \in [z+1, y_{z+1}]$ as well as a monotone increasing path from $\sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)$ to $\sigma^+(z+1, y_{e'})(1)$ in the 46Δ -free space of $\kappa_z(x, y)$ and $\sigma^+(i, j)$.

Let x_e be the first breakpoint corresponding to e such that $d(P(t_{x_e}), P(t_i)) \leq 18\Delta$. Since e is active, x_e has to exist. We distinguish between the cases that the path starts in a point p_e before or after $\sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)$ on e :




Figure 7: Example for a curve P and breakpoints z, i, j such that the approximation oracle returns "Yes" for the query $z \in r_{i,j}$. The path from p_{e_1} to p_{e_2} in the 10Δ -free space diagram is a monotone increasing path from the active edge e_1 to the active edge e_2 . The edges are active since $d(P(t_i), P(t_{x_{e_1}})) \leq 18\Delta$ and $d(P(t_j), P(t_{y_{e_2}})) \leq 18\Delta$. The path from $x' = \sigma^-(x_{e_1}, z)(0)$ to $y' = \sigma^+(z+1, y_{e_2})(1)$ in the free space diagram gives a parametrization of $\kappa_z(x_{e_1}, y_{e_2})$ and $\sigma^+(i, j)$ yielding $d_F(\kappa_z(x_{e_1}, y_{e_2}), \sigma^+(i, j)) \leq 46\Delta$ as proven in Lemma 22.

(I) The path starts in a point p_e after $\sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)$ on e :

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& d(\sigma^+(i, j)(0), \sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)) \\
& \leq d(\sigma^+(i, j)(0), P(t_i)) + d(P(t_i), P(t_{x_e})) + d(P(t_{x_e}), \sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)) \\
& \leq 4\Delta + 18\Delta + 4\Delta \\
& \leq 26\Delta
\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality above follows by the choice of x_e and the fact that $\sigma^+(i, j)$ and $\sigma^-(x_e, z)$ are $(4\Delta, 2\ell)$ -simplifications of $P[t_i, t_j]$ and $P[t_{x_e}, t_z]$. Since the path starts in a reachable area of the free space diagram we have

$$d(\sigma^+(i, j)(0), p_e) \leq 10\Delta$$

Since p_e and $\sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)$ lie on the same edge of $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$ the segment $\overline{p_e, \sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)}$ is a subcurve of $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$. The Fréchet distance

$$d_F(\overline{p_e, \sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)}, \sigma^+(i, j)(0))$$

is at most

$$\max(d(\sigma^+(i, j)(0), \sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)), d(\sigma^+(i, j)(0), p_e)) \leq 26\Delta$$

since the Fréchet distance of a line segment and a point is attained at the start or end point of the line segment. The horizontal line segment from the point $(p_e, \sigma^+(i, j)(0))$ to the point $(\sigma^-(x_e, z)(0), \sigma^+(i, j)(0))$ is therefore contained in the 46Δ -free space of $\kappa_z(x, y)$ and $\sigma^+(i, j)$.

(II) The path starts in a point p_e before $\sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)$ on e :

We again have

$$d(\sigma^+(i, j)(0), \sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)) \leq 26\Delta$$

and

$$d(\sigma^+(i, j)(0), p_e) \leq 10\Delta$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d(p_e, \sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)) & \leq d(p_e, \sigma^+(i, j)(0)) + d(\sigma^+(i, j)(0), \sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)) \\
& \leq 10\Delta + 26\Delta \\
& \leq 36\Delta
\end{aligned}$$

The path has to pass the vertical line in the free space diagram through $\sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)$ at some height h . Note that the path is totally included in the 10Δ -free space. So for each point p on $\sigma^+(i, j)[0, h]$ there is a point q on $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$ between p_e and $\sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)$ such that

$$d(p, q) \leq 10\Delta.$$

Because q lies on the same edge of $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$ as $\sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)$ and p_e we have

$$d(\sigma^-(x_e, z)(0), q) \leq d(\sigma^-(x_e, z)(0), p_e) \leq 36\Delta$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
d(\sigma^-(x_e, z)(0), p) & \leq d(\sigma^-(x_e, z)(0), q) + d(q, p) \\
& \leq 36\Delta + 10\Delta \\
& \leq 46\Delta
\end{aligned}$$

So we can replace the path in the 10Δ -free space starting at p_e up to height h with a vertical line segment from $(\sigma^-(x_e, z)(0), \sigma^+(i, j)(0))$ up to height h . This line segment is then fully contained in the 46Δ -free space.

By symmetry, we can apply the same arguments for changing the path in the free space diagram, so that the path ends in $\sigma^-(z+1, y)(1)$ for some breakpoint y . Therefore we can always find a monotone increasing path from $\sigma^-(x_e, z)(0)$ to $\sigma^+(z+1, y_{e'})(1)$ in the 46Δ -free space of $\kappa_z(x, y)$ and $\sigma^+(i, j)$. For an example of such a path see Figure 7. The vertical path starting in x' is an example for Case II and the horizontal path from p_{e_2} to y' is an example for Case I (by symmetry for the end of the path).

ii) We prove that the oracle returns the answer "Yes" if $z \in r_{i,j}$:

So let $z \in r_{i,j}$. Then we have $d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), \sigma^+(i, j)) \leq 10\Delta$ for some $x_z \leq x \leq z$ and $z+1 \leq y \leq y_{z+1}$. Therefore there is a path in the free space diagram from $(\sigma^+(i, j)(0), \sigma^-(x, z)(0))$ to $((\sigma^+(i, j)(1), \sigma^+(z+1, y)(1)))$. It remains to show that the edges corresponding to x and y are active. This follows by triangle inequality. In particular we have that $d(P(t_i), P(t_x))$ is at most

$$d(P(t_i), \sigma^+(i, j)(0)) + d(\sigma^+(i, j)(0), \sigma^-(x, z)(0)) + d(\sigma^-(x, z)(0), P(t_x))$$

and by the above this is at most 18Δ , and analogously $d(P(t_j), P(t_y)) \leq 18\Delta$. \square

Running time. First we analyse the preprocessing time needed to build the data structure for the oracle then we analyse the query time of the oracle.

Since one application of the algorithm of Agarwal et. al. [2] needs $O(n \log(n))$ time and $O(n)$ space, we need $O(mn \log(n))$ time and $O(n + m\ell)$ space to construct the simplifications $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$, $\sigma^o(z, z+1)$ and $\sigma^+(z, y_z)$ for every $z \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. To construct the pointers from each edge to the first and last breakpoint on the edge we need additional $O(m + \ell)$ time for each simplification. In total this needs at most $O(mn \log(n) + m^2)$ time and $O(n + m\ell)$ space.

To construct the matrix M with the $O(m^2)$ entries of $z_{i,j}$ we need for each breakpoint i a time of $O(m)$ and a space of $O(m)$ to go through the list of all m breakpoints and save the entries of $z_{i,j}$. So in total we need $O(m^2)$ time and $O(m^2)$ space for all entries. Combined with the time and space requirement for the simplifications we need $O(m(n \log(n) + m + \ell))$ time and $O(m\ell + m^2)$ space for the whole preprocessing.

To answer a query the oracle builds a free space diagram of $\sigma^+(i, j)$ and $\kappa_z(x_z, y_{z+1})$. To do that, it needs the simplifications $\sigma^+(i, j)$, $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$, $\sigma^o(z, z+1)$ and $\sigma^+(z+1, y_z)$. The simplifications $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$, $\sigma^o(z, z+1)$ and $\sigma^+(z+1, y_z)$ were already computed during preprocessing. The simplification $\sigma^+(i, j)$ can be computed in $O(\log(\ell))$ time with binary searches on $\sigma^+(i, y_i)$ and $\sigma^+(z, y_z)$. With the matrix M , it can be checked if an edge of $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$ or $\sigma^+(z+1, y_z)$ is active in $O(1)$ time. Therefore all active edges can be found in $O(\ell)$ time. The construction of the free space diagram of two curves with complexity $O(\ell)$ can then be done with standard methods as described earlier in $O(\ell^2)$ time. Testing the existence of a monotone increasing path from any of the active edges is then done as described above in the paragraph about the data structure. Note that given $L_{s,t}^R$, $B_{s,t}^R$, $L_{s+1,t}^F$ and $B_{s,t+1}^F$, we can construct $L_{s+1,t}^R$ and $L_{s,t+1}^R$ in $O(1)$ time. Therefore, given that we know for each edge e_t of $\sigma^-(x_z, z)$ if it is active, we can compute $L_{1,t}^R$ and $B_{1,t}^R$ for all edges e_t in $O(\ell)$ time. So we can compute all $L_{s,t}^R$ and $B_{s,t}^R$ in $O(\ell^2)$ time. Since $\sigma^+(z+1, y_{z+1})$ has at most 2ℓ edges, the check for each of the active edges e_t of $\sigma^+(z+1, y_{z+1})$ if $B_{s^*+1,t}^R \neq \emptyset$ can then be done in $O(\ell)$ time. Therefore, testing if there exists a monotone increasing path with the described properties can be done in $O(\ell^2)$ time. Therefore the total query time is $O(\ell^2)$, as well. These results for the running time imply the following theorem.

Theorem 23. *One can build a data structure for the approximation oracle of size $O(m\ell + m^2)$ in time $O(m^2 + mn \log(n))$ and space $O(n + m\ell + m^2)$ that has a query time of $O(\ell^2)$.*

6.5 Applying the framework for computing a set cover

In order to apply Theorem 6 directly, we technically need to define a set system based on our data structure. Concretely, we define a new set system that is implicitly given by the approximation oracle. Let $I(z, (i, j))$ be the output of the approximation oracle for $z \in Z$ and $(i, j) \in T$ with

$$\begin{aligned} I(z, (i, j)) &= 1 && \text{if the oracle answers "Yes"} \\ I(z, (i, j)) &= 0 && \text{if the oracle answers "No"} \end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_4$ be the set system consisting of sets of the form

$$\tilde{r}_{i,j} = \{z \in Z \mid I(z, (i, j)) = 1\}$$

With Theorem 23 we immediately get

Theorem 24. *One can build a data structure of size $O(m\ell + m^2)$ in time $O(m^2 + mn \log(n))$ and $O(n + m\ell + m^2)$ space that answers for an element of the ground set Z and a set of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_4$, whether this element is contained in the set in $O(\ell^2)$ time.*

Since for all (i, j) we have that $r_{i,j} \subseteq \tilde{r}_{i,j}$ it holds that for each set cover of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_3$, there is also a set cover of the same size for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_4$. Together with Lemma 20 this directly implies

Lemma 25. *If there exists a set cover S of \mathcal{R} , then there exists a set cover of the same size for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_4$.*

For the set system $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_4$ we further can derive a lemma corresponding to Lemma 19 using that for $z \in \tilde{r}_{i,j}$ we have $d_F(\kappa_z(x, y), \sigma^+(i, j)) \leq 46\Delta$. The proof is in all other parts completely analogous.

Lemma 26. *Assume there exists a set cover for \mathcal{R} with parameter Δ . Let S be a set cover of size k for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_4$. We can derive from S a set of k cluster centers $C \subseteq \mathbb{X}_\ell^d$ and such that $\phi(P, C) \leq 50\Delta$.*

So if we apply Theorem 6 to the set system $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_4$ given by the approximation oracle we merely lose a constant approximation factor for our clustering problem in comparison to the direct application on the set system $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_3$. This leads to the following result.

6.6 The result

We apply Theorem 6 to get the following result for computing a set cover of $(Z, \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_4)$. For Theorem 6, we use Theorem 24, $|Z| = m - 1$ and $|\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_4| = O(m^2)$.

Theorem 27. *Let k be the minimum size of a set cover for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_4$. There exists an algorithm that computes a set cover for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_4$ of size $O(k \log(m) \log(\log(m)k))$ in*

$$O\left(mk \log\left(\frac{m}{k}\right) \ell^2 (k \log(m) \log(k \log(m))) + m + mn \log(n)\right)$$

expected running time and $O(n + m\ell + m^2)$ space.

This result finally implies our main result for the clustering problem.

Theorem 28. *Let $P : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a polygonal curve of complexity n with breakpoints $0 \leq t_1, \dots, t_m \leq 1$. Assume there exists a set $C^* \subset \mathbb{X}_\ell^d$ of size k , such that $\phi(P, C^*) \leq \Delta$. Then there exists an algorithm that computes a set $C \subset \mathbb{X}_{2\ell}^d$ of size $O(k \log(m) \log(\log(m)k))$ in an expected running time of*

$$O\left(mk \log\left(\frac{m}{k}\right) \ell^2 (k \log(m) \log(k \log(m))) + m + mn \log(n)\right)$$

and $O(n + m\ell + m^2)$ space such that $\phi(P, C) \leq 50\Delta$.

Proof. The theorem follows immediately by the combination of Theorem 27, Lemma 25 and Lemma 26. \square

Note that in Theorem 28 we have $k < m$ if such a set C^* exists. This is the case since for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$ the subcurve $P[t_i, t_{i+1}]$ has to be covered by only one element of C^* . So if we had $k > m-1$ then we would have more center curves in C^* than elements to cover. Therefore we get an expected running time of $\tilde{O}(km^2\ell^2 + mn)$ if we omit logarithmic factors.

7 Proof of Theorem 6

Let \mathcal{R} be a set system with ground set X . We denote with \mathcal{R}^* the **dual set system** with ground set \mathcal{R} and where each set $r_x \in \mathcal{R}^*$ is defined by an element $x \in X$ as follows $r_x = \{r \in \mathcal{R} | x \in r\}$. The dual set system of \mathcal{R}^* is again \mathcal{R} . We say a subset $A \subseteq X$ is **shattered** by \mathcal{R} if for any $A' \subseteq A$ there exists an $r \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $A' = r \cap A$. The **VC-dimension** of \mathcal{R} is the maximal size of a set A that is shattered by \mathcal{R} .

In addition to the set cover problem, we define the dual **hitting set problem**. Let \mathcal{R} be a set system with ground set X . A **hitting set** of \mathcal{R} is a subset $S \subseteq X$ such that every set of \mathcal{R} contains at least one element of S . The hitting set problem is to find a hitting set for a given \mathcal{R} of minimum size. The hitting set problem for \mathcal{R} is equivalent to the set cover problem for the dual set system \mathcal{R}^* .

Let \mathcal{R} be a set system with finite ground set X and with an additive weight function w on X . An ε -**net** is a subset $S \subseteq X$, such that every set of \mathcal{R} of weight at least $\varepsilon \cdot w(X)$ contains at least one element of S . That is, if $w(x) = 1$ for each $x \in X$, then an ε -Net is a hitting set for the “heavy” sets of \mathcal{R} that contain at least an ε -fraction of the ground set.

Now, we intend to apply the algorithm described in [4] for computing an approximate set cover of a given set system. More precisely, the algorithm computes a hitting set of the dual set system. The algorithm assumes the following subroutines.

A **net finder** of size s for a set system (X, \mathcal{R}) is an algorithm A that, given $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and a weight function w on X , returns an $(1/r)$ -net of size $s(r)$ for (X, \mathcal{R}) with weight w . Also, a **verifier** is an algorithm B that, given a subset $H \subseteq X$, either states (correctly) that H is a hitting set, or returns a nonempty set r of R such that $r \cap H = \emptyset$.

Given these two subroutines and a finite set system (X, \mathcal{R}) , their algorithm proceeds as follows. In each iteration, we use the net finder to compute an ε -net S of \mathcal{R} (for a specific value of ε). Use the verifier to test if S is also a hitting set for \mathcal{R} . If yes, we return S . If no, then the verifier returns a witness set r that does not contain any element of S . We increase the weight of each element of r by a factor of 2. Then repeat until we find a hitting set. We describe an easy adaptation of this algorithm that suits our needs next.

Let \mathcal{R} be a set system with finite ground set X and finite VC-dimension δ . An effective way to implement the net-finder is via a random sample from the ground set, as guaranteed by the ε -net theorem [18] by Haussler and Welzl.

Theorem 29 ([18]). *For any (X, \mathcal{R}) of finite VC-dimension δ , finite $A \subseteq X$ and $0 < \epsilon, \alpha < 1$, if N is a subset of A obtained by at least*

$$\max \left(\frac{4}{3} \log \left(\frac{2}{\alpha} \right), \frac{8\delta}{\epsilon} \log \left(\frac{8\delta}{\epsilon} \right) \right)$$

random independent draws, then N is an ϵ -net of A for \mathcal{R} with probability at least $1 - \alpha$.

Thus, the net-finder can be implemented to run in $O(|X|)$ time and $O(|X|)$ space, by taking a sample from X where the weights correspond to probabilities. We call this the **probabilistic net-finder**. While verifying that a set is an ε -net could be costly in our setting, we can observe that this is actually not necessary. Indeed, we can modify the behaviour of the verifier as follows.

Definition 30 (Extended verifier). *Given a set $S \subseteq X$, the extended verifier returns one of the following:*

- (i) S is a hitting set.
- (ii) A witness set r with $r \cap S = \emptyset$, and $w(r) \leq \epsilon$.
- (iii) A witness set r with $r \cap S = \emptyset$, and $w(r) > \epsilon$.

To implement the extended verifier we assume that we have an oracle that returns for any given $r \in \mathcal{R}$ and $z \in X$ if $z \in r$. Let $T_P(\mathcal{R})$ denote the preprocessing time to build a data structure for the oracle and let $T_Q(\mathcal{R})$ denote the time needed to answer the query $z \in r$. Let further $S_O(\mathcal{R})$ be the space required for the data structure of the oracle. Now, the extended verifier can be implemented to run in

$$O(|S| \cdot |\mathcal{R}| \cdot T_Q(\mathcal{R}) + |X| \cdot T_Q(\mathcal{R}))$$

time by using $|\mathcal{R}|$ linear scans over S , one for each set in \mathcal{R} . We determine for every set $r \in \mathcal{R}$ whether it is hit by an element of S , by calling the set system oracle on r and the corresponding set and elements in S . If we find a set that is not hit by any of the elements in S , we compute its weight explicitly by using $|X|$ calls to $T_Q(\mathcal{R})$ and return the appropriate answer (ii) or (iii). In case (ii), we return the witness set that we have just computed explicitly, that is, we return all elements of this set, in order for the reweighting to be applied. If we do not find such a set, then S is a hitting set and we return (i).

Algorithm. Using the above implementation of the probabilistic net-finder and the extended verifier, the algorithm for computing a hitting set now proceed as follows. In each iteration we use the probabilistic net-finder to sample a candidate set $S \subseteq X$. The sample size is chosen large enough that S is an ε -net with probability greater $\frac{1}{2}$ (for a specific value of ε). Given S , we apply extended verifier. If the verifier returns that S is a hitting set (case (i)) then the algorithm terminates with S as a result. If the verifier returns a witness set r with $r \cap S = \emptyset$, and $w(r) \leq \varepsilon$ (case (ii)) then we increase the weight of each element of r . The algorithm keeps track of the weight of each element and the weight of the whole ground set. If the verifier returns a witness set r with $r \cap S = \emptyset$, and $w(r) > \varepsilon$ (case (ii)) then S is not an ε -net and we do not change anything. We repeat these steps until we find a hitting set.

We obtain the following result.

Theorem 31. *For a given finite set system (X, \mathcal{R}) with finite VC-dimension δ , assume there exists a hitting set of size k . Then, there exists an algorithm that computes a hitting set of size $O(\delta k \log \delta k)$ in*

$$O\left(k \log\left(\frac{|X|}{k}\right) T_Q(\mathcal{R})(\delta k \log(\delta k)|\mathcal{R}| + |X|) + T_P(\mathcal{R})\right).$$

expected running time and $O(|X| + S_O(\mathcal{R}))$ space.

Proof. We first build a data structure for the oracle in $T_P(\mathcal{R})$ time. Then we use the algorithm described above with $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2k}$. In each iteration of the algorithm the computed random sample of size $O(k \delta \log(\delta k))$ is an ϵ -net with probability greater $\frac{1}{2}$. Therefore the expected number of iterations until we find an ϵ -net is at most 2.

If we find an ϵ -net in some iteration of the algorithm then we are in case (i) or (ii). As soon as we are in case (i) the algorithm terminates and outputs a hitting set of size $O(\delta k \log(\delta k))$.

Let H be a hitting set of \mathcal{R} with $|H| = k$. The number of times we can be in case (ii) before being in case (i) is bounded by $4k \log(\frac{|X|}{k})$. Indeed, after this number of reweighting steps, the weight of H would be bigger than the weight of the ground set. The calculation of this bound has already been done in [4]. We include it here for the sake of completeness.

Let r be the set returned by the verifier in one iteration of being in case (ii). Since H is a hitting set, we have $H \cap r \neq \emptyset$. Let w be our weight function and let z_h be the number of times the weight of h has been doubled after i iterations in case (ii). Then we have after i iterations in case (ii) that

$$w(H) = \sum_{h \in H} 2^{z_h}, \text{ where } \sum_{h \in H} z_h \geq i.$$

By the convexity of the exponential function, we get $w(H) \geq k 2^{\frac{i}{k}}$. Since $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2k}$, we also have for the ground set Z that

$$w(X) \leq |X| \left(1 + \frac{1}{2k}\right)^i \leq |X| e^{\frac{i}{2k}}.$$

Because H is a subset of X and therefore $w(H) \leq w(X)$, we get in total

$$k 2^{\frac{i}{k}} \leq |X| e^{\frac{i}{2k}} \leq |X| 2^{\frac{3i}{4k}}.$$

It directly follows that $i \leq 4k \log(\frac{|X|}{k})$. Combining this result with the expected number of iterations until we find an ϵ -net, we conclude that the expected number of iterations before the algorithm terminates is smaller than $8k \log(\frac{|X|}{k})$.

In each iteration, the algorithm computes a random sample in $O(|X|)$ time and applies the extended verifier in $O(|\mathcal{R}|k\delta\log(k)T_Q(\mathcal{R}) + |X|T_Q(\mathcal{R}))$ time. If a reweighting needs to be applied (case (ii)) this can be done in $O(|X|)$ time. So each iteration of the algorithm has a running time of $O(|\mathcal{R}|\delta k\log(\delta k)T_Q(\mathcal{R}) + |X|T_Q(\mathcal{R}))$. In total we get an expected running time of

$$O(k\log(\frac{|X|}{k})T_Q(\mathcal{R})(\delta k\log(\delta k)|\mathcal{R}| + |X|) + T_P(\mathcal{R})).$$

The theorem follows by the observation that both the net-finder and the verifier need $O(|X|)$ space. \square

By applying Theorem 31 on the dual set system \mathcal{R}^* and using the following upper bound for the VC-dimension of \mathcal{R}^* we directly get Theorem 6.

Lemma 32. *Let (X, \mathcal{R}) be a set system. The VC-dimension of the dual set system \mathcal{R}^* is at most $\log |X|$.*

Proof. Note that there are at most $|X|$ different sets in \mathcal{R}^* . Let A be a set of size t that is shattered by \mathcal{R}^* . Since there are 2^t different subset of A , and they all need to be split off from A by a different set of \mathcal{R}^* , we have $2^t \leq |X|$, so it follows that $t \leq \log |X|$. \square

Theorem 6. *For a given finite set system (X, \mathcal{R}) assume there exists a set cover of size k . Then, there exists an algorithm that computes a set cover of size $O(\delta k\log \delta k)$ with $\delta = \log(|X|)$ in*

$$O\left(k\log\left(\frac{|\mathcal{R}|}{k}\right)T_Q(\mathcal{R})(|X|k\log(|X|k)\log(\log(|X|)) + |\mathcal{R}|) + T_P(\mathcal{R})\right).$$

expected running time and $O(|\mathcal{R}| + S_O(\mathcal{R}))$ space.

8 NP-hardness

We note that the problem described in Section 3 for $\ell = 1$ is a specific instance of a k -center problem which is NP-complete. However, we require that the input set is a connected polygonal curve. It is tempting to believe that this restriction could make the problem easier. We show in this section that the problem is still NP-hard. Our reduction is from PLANAR-MONOTONE-3SAT, with m_{SAT} clauses and n_{SAT} variables. We show how to construct an instance B of a decision version of our problem given an instance A of PLANAR-MONOTONE-3SAT, which is NP-hard [12]. We can assume that A is given by a plane rectilinear bipartite graph between variables and clauses where variables are embedded on the x-axis, edges do not cross the x-axis, clauses are adjacent to two or three variables, and are partitioned between **positive** and **negative** whether they are embedded in the upper or lower half-plane respectively. The problem asks whether there exist an assignment from the variables to $\{\mathbf{true}, \mathbf{false}\}$ such that every positive (negative) clause is adjacent to at least one **true** (**false**) variable.

Problem definition. We define the decision version of our problem as follows. The instance is defined by a polygonal curve P with breakpoints $0 = t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_m = 1$ and $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The problem asks whether there exist a set C of k points, such that

$$\max_{i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}} \min_{q \in C} \max_{t_i \leq t \leq t_{i+1}} \|P(t) - q\| \leq \Delta$$

Note that this is equivalent to $\phi(P, C) \leq \Delta$. A solution C is said to be in **canonical form** if every point in C coincides with a breakpoint, i.e., one of the points $P(t_i)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.

Outline of proof. We first show how to build an instance B of our problem from A . We then show that any positive solution C of B can be converted in a positive solution C' in canonical form. We also show that C' exists if and only if A has a positive solution, which will conclude our proof. An example of the reduction is shown in Figure 10. The reduction uses paths formed by unit segments called wires. Figure 8 (a) shows circles whose centers represent points in a locally optimal solution. Any optimal solution would choose either

the red or the blue circles' centers. A variable is represented by a cycle as shown in Figure 8 (c) formed by 2 vertical paths and 2 “zig-zag” paths connecting their endpoints. The length of such paths depend on the number of times the variable appears in clauses. Clauses are represented by a segment whose endpoint is called a clause vertex shown in Figure 8 (b) as a star. It is next to three wires connected to variable gadgets. Informally, such segment can be covered by a disk centered at a breakpoint contained in one of the wires if the wire carries a **true** signal.




Figure 8: (a) Wire. (b) Clause vertex is shown as a star. (c) Cycle representing a variable with $r = 2$.

Construction. We modify the embedding in A as follows. Refer to Figure 10. Replace each variable with a cycle in the hexagonal grid separated by a **separator gadget** shown in Figure 9 (a). Each cycle contains two vertical edges of length 5 that are all vertically aligned and $4\sqrt{3}r$ apart where r is the maximum number of incidences of the variable in either positive or negative clauses. In order to close each cycle, connect the upper (resp., lower) endpoints of the vertical edges with a “zig-zag” formed by $2r$ edges of length 4 and slopes $1/\sqrt{3}$ and $-1/\sqrt{3}$ (resp., $-1/\sqrt{3}$ and $1/\sqrt{3}$). We call every even vertex in this upper (resp., lower) “zig-zag” path a **positive** (resp., **negative**) **literal vertex**. For each clause, the embedding of A allows us to choose two or three literal vertices so that each clause can be connected to literal vertices of their incident variables in a planar way. For each clause we define three **clause vertices** as follows. We define positive clauses while negative clauses are defined analogously by reflections. Let p_1 , p_2 , and p_3 (if it exists) be the three literal vertices, ordered from left to right, to be connected by the clause, and let t be the smallest distance between them. The middle clause vertex c_2 is above p_2 by $t/\sqrt{3} + 1$. Let the left clause vertex c_1 (resp., right clause vertex c_3) be $c_2 + (-\sqrt{3}/2, -1/2)$ (resp., $c_2 + (\sqrt{3}/2, -1/2)$). Connect p_2 to c_2 with a vertical edge, and p_1 to c_1 with a convex with 3 bends as in Figure 10 so that the length of the vertical edge is 3. Finally, subdivide each edge into edges of length 1 and at each bend add 6 unit edges as shown in the **turn gadget** in Figure 9 (c). We obtain an embedding of a graph G containing only unit edges. We partition the edges of G into two subsets E_1 and E_2 as follows. The set E_1 contains edges in separator gadgets, the 6 added edges in each turn gadget and the edge adjacent to c_2 for each clause. The set E_2 is the set of remaining edges. Define P as the path obtained by an Euler tour defined by a DFS of G . Set $\Delta = 1$ and place a breakpoint

on each vertex of P . Finally, set $k = \frac{|E_2|}{2} + 3(n_{SAT} - 1)$. This finalizes the construction.

Theorem 33. *Let $P : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be a polygonal curve of complexity n with breakpoints $0 \leq t_1, \dots, t_m \leq 1$. It is NP-complete to decide whether there exist a set C of points in \mathbb{R}^2 such that $\phi(P, C) \leq \Delta$ and $|C| \leq k$ for given $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*




Figure 9: (a) and (b) show the separator gadget in black, and some edges of the adjacent variable gadgets in gray. (c) and (d) show the turn gadget. Disks indicate potential optimal solutions.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) We assume that A admits a positive solution, and constructs a positive solution C for B as follows. For each variable x_i , add all the odd (even) points in the spine of the corresponding variable gadget to C if x_i is set to **true** (**false**) in A 's solution. Do the same for all wire gadgets and the portion of the clause gadgets corresponding to x_i . For each separator gadget, add the three green points shown in Figure 9 to C . This finalizes the construction of C . By construction, $|C| = k$, the variable, wire and separator gadgets are covered by disks centered at C . Because every positive (negative) clause in A is adjacent to a variable assigned **true** (**false**), the clause segment is covered by a disk centered at the spine of a incident wire. Then, C is a positive solution for B .

(\Leftarrow) We assume that B admits a positive solution C , and constructs a positive solution for A . We first show we can construct a canonical solution C' from C with $|C'| \leq |C|$.

Consider the separator gadget in Figure 9 (b). The positions of the centers of unit disks that cover segment aa' form a lune defined by the intersection of the unit disks centered at a and a' . The analogous is true for segments cd and $c'd'$. Such lunes are disjoint, hence C has 3 distinct points, c_1 , c_2 and c_3 , to cover such segments. Note that they cannot cover segments outside of the separator gadget. We can move them to a , d and d' so that the set of segments that they cover is either the same or a superset of the previously covered segments. The following assumes that (i) every separator gadget is covered by three points in C as in Figure 9 (a).

Consider the turn gadget in Figure 9 (d). Assume that ab and $a'b$ are respectively covered by different points c_1 and c_2 in C . Then, we can move c_1 and c_2 to c and c' while covering the same segments and




Figure 10: Example of reduction from $(x_1 \vee x_2 \vee x_4) \wedge (\overline{x_1} \vee \overline{x_2} \vee \overline{x_3}) \wedge (\overline{x_1} \vee \overline{x_4})$. The centers of the disks are an optimal solution to the instance.

possibly more. Now, assume that ab and $a'b$ are covered by $c_1 \in C$. Then, c_1 is in the intersection of the two lunes shown in Figure 9 (d). The only segments it can cover are ab , $a'b$, cb and $c'b$. Then we can move it to b without decreasing its coverage. Assuming that turn gadgets are in canonical form, we can apply the moving argument at each remaining segment of P in order to obtain a canonical solution C' , moving each point $c \in C$ to a breakpoint.

By (i), C' has $\frac{|E_2|}{2}$ points to cover segments with endpoints at literal vertices. Note that each point can cover at most 2 edges in E_2 . Then each point must cover exactly 2 edges in E_2 . It follows that, for each variable in A , C' contains points at either all positive literal vertices and none at negative vertices, or all negative literal vertices and none at positive vertices. Because the clause segments are covered, the clauses of A are satisfied, and we can obtain a solution for A . That concludes the proof of NP-hardness.

The problem is in NP since verifying whether a given set C is a solution for our problem can be done by computing the Δ -free space diagrams for each curve in C and P , and greedily partitioning P , verifying whether it is covered. This concludes the proof of the theorem. \square

9 The VC-dimension of the dual set system

Now we consider the set system \mathcal{R}^* dual to \mathcal{R} and we analyze its VC-dimension. For the definition of the dual set system and of the VC dimension, please refer to Section 7. The ground set is \mathbb{X}_ℓ^d . Every set in the dual is defined by an element of the ground set of the primal set system and it has the same incidence

relationships. Any $r_z \in \mathcal{R}^*$ is defined by an index $z \in Z$ as follows

$$r_z = \{Q \mid \exists i \leq z < j \text{ with } d_F(Q, P[t_i, t_j]) \leq \Delta\} \quad (3)$$

We show that the VC-dimension is in $\Theta(\log m)$ in the worst case for any reasonable values of d and ℓ . Interestingly, our bounds on the VC-dimension are independent of d and n . In fact, quite surprisingly, they also hold if P is non-polygonal. The upper bound that the VC-dimension of \mathcal{R}^* is at most $\log(m)$ follows directly by Lemma 32. It remains to show the lower bound.

Theorem 34. *For $d \geq 2$ and $\ell \geq 1$ the VC-dimension of \mathcal{R}^* is in $\Omega(\log m)$ in the worst case.*

Proof. We show the lower bound for $\ell = 1$ and $d = 2$; this implies the bound for larger values of ℓ and d . To show the lower bound, we need to construct a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ with $|A| = t$ for $t \in \Omega(\log m)$, and a P with breakpoints t_1, \dots, t_m , such that A is shattered by \mathcal{R}^* as defined by P .

We use the lower bound construction of [15] for the VC-dimension of the set system of metric balls under the Fréchet distance centered at curves of complexity t on the ground set \mathbb{R}^2 . According to this result, we can find a set A of t points in \mathbb{R}^2 , such that for every subset $A' \subseteq A$ we can find a curve $P_{A'} \in \mathbb{X}_t^d$, such that

$$A' = A \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid d_F(x, P_{A'}) \leq \Delta\} \quad (4)$$

We will now construct P as the concatenation of these curves with breakpoints at the start and endpoints of these curves, where to concatenate them we linearly interpolate between the endpoints of consecutive curves.

In order to show correctness of the resulting construction we observe that the definition of the Fréchet distance can be simplified if one of the curves is a point. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and let $P' = P[t_i, t_j]$, then

$$d_F(x, P') = \max_{t \in [0,1]} (x, P'(t)) \quad (5)$$

This implies that for the case $\ell = 1$ our set system \mathcal{R}^* actually has a simpler structure. In particular, any $r_z \in \mathcal{R}^*$ defined by an index $z \in Z$ can be rewritten as follows

$$r_z = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \exists i \leq z \leq j \text{ with } d_F(x, P[t_i, t_j]) \leq \Delta\} \quad (6)$$

$$= \bigcup_{i \leq z < j} \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid d_F(x, P[t_i, t_j]) \leq \Delta\} \quad (7)$$

$$= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid d_F(x, P[t_z, t_{z+1}]) \leq \Delta\} \quad (8)$$

Thus, with our choice of P and breakpoints $t_1 < \dots < t_m$, we have that for any $A' \subseteq A$ there exists an index z with $1 \leq z < m$, such that $A' = A \cap r_z$ holds as required by (4). Finally, the number of breakpoints we used is $m = 2^{t+1}$ (two breakpoints for each subset of A). Therefore, we have $t \geq \log(m) - 1$. \square

Theorem 35. *For $d \geq 1$ and $\ell \geq 2$ the VC-dimension of \mathcal{R}^* is in $\Omega(\log m)$ in the worst case.*

Proof. We construct a curve P with breakpoints as follows. Let $t \in \mathbb{N}$ be a parameter of the construction. Let $\Delta = \frac{1}{3}$. The curve P is constructed from a series of 2^t line segments starting at 0 and ending at $t+2$ with certain breakpoints along these line segments to be specified later. We call these segments **subset encoder segment**. These line segments are connected by $2^t - 1$ line segments starting at $t+2$ and ending at 0. Those line segments will not contain any breakpoints and we call them **connector segments**. Let $A = \{1, \dots, t\}$ for each subset $A' \subseteq A$ we create one subset encoder segment with breakpoints at the values of A' , in addition we put two breakpoints at the values $t+1$ and at $t+2$. The curve P is defined by concatenating all 2^t subset encoder segments with the connector segments in between. Figure 11 shows an example of this construction for $t = 3$. Now, consider the following set of line segments in \mathbb{R} . $S = \{\overline{s_1 s_2} \mid s_1 \in A, s_2 = t+2\}$. We claim that S is shattered by \mathcal{R}^* defined on P and Δ . Therefore, the VC-dimension is t . The number of breakpoints m we used is upper-bounded by $(t+2)2^t$ and therefore $t \geq \Omega(\log m)$. \square




Figure 11: Schematic drawing of $P : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in the construction for the lower bound to the VC-dimension. Parameters of the construction are $\Delta = \frac{1}{3}$, $\ell = 2$ and $t = 3$. The shattered set of line segments in \mathbb{R} is $S = \{\overline{1, 5}, \overline{2, 5}, \overline{3, 5}\}$ with $|S| = t$. The subset encoder segments are shown vertically upwards, the connector segments are shown diagonally downwards. The horizontal axis shows the parametrization of the curve. The figure also shows the subset $S' = \{\overline{1, 5}, \overline{2, 5}\}$ and indicates the breakpoint at index z , such that $r_z \cap S = S'$.

References

- [1] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Kyle Fox, Kamesh Munagala, Abhinandan Nath, Jiangwei Pan, and Erin Taylor. Subtrajectory clustering: Models and algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 37th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems*, SIGMOD/PODS '18, page 75–87, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [2] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Sariel Har-Peled, Nabil H. Mustafa, and Yusu Wang. Near-linear time approximation algorithms for curve simplification. *Algorithmica*, 42(3):203–219, 2005.
- [3] Helmut Alt and Michael Godau. Computing the fréchet distance between two polygonal curves. *Int. J. Comput. Geom. Appl.*, 5:75–91, 1995.
- [4] Hervé Brönnimann and Michael T Goodrich. Almost optimal set covers in finite vc-dimension. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 14(4):463–479, 1995.
- [5] Kevin Buchin, Maike Buchin, David Duran, Brittany Terese Fasy, Roel Jacobs, Vera Sacristan, Rodrigo I. Silveira, Frank Staals, and Carola Wenk. Clustering trajectories for map construction. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGSPATIAL International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems*, SIGSPATIAL '17, New York, NY, USA, 2017. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [6] Kevin Buchin, Maike Buchin, Joachim Gudmundsson, Jorren Hendriks, Erfan Hosseini Sereshgi, Vera Sacristán, Rodrigo I. Silveira, Jorrick Sleijster, Frank Staals, and Carola Wenk. Improved map construction using subtrajectory clustering. In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM SIGSPATIAL Workshop on Location-Based Recommendations, Geosocial Networks, and Geoadvertising*, LocalRec'20, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [7] Kevin Buchin, Maike Buchin, Joachim Gudmundsson, Maarten Löffler, and Jun Luo. Detecting commuting patterns by clustering subtrajectories. In Seok-Hee Hong, Hiroshi Nagamochi, and Takuro Fukunaga, editors, *Algorithms and Computation*, pages 644–655, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

- [8] Kevin Buchin, Anne Driemel, Joachim Gudmundsson, Michael Horton, Irina Kostitsyna, Maarten Löffler, and Martijn Struijs. Approximating (k, l) -center clustering for curves. In Timothy M. Chan, editor, *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2019, San Diego, California, USA, January 6-9, 2019*, pages 2922–2938. SIAM, 2019.
- [9] Kevin Buchin, Anne Driemel, Natasja van de L’Isle, and André Nusser. Klcluster: Center-based clustering of trajectories. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGSPATIAL International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems, SIGSPATIAL ’19*, page 496–499, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [10] Maike Buchin, Anne Driemel, and Dennis Rohde. Approximating (k, l) -median clustering for polygonal curves. In *SODA 2021*. SIAM, 2021. (To appear).
- [11] V. Chvatal. A greedy heuristic for the set-covering problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 4(3):233–235, 1979.
- [12] Mark de Berg and Amirali Khosravi. Optimal binary space partitions in the plane. In *International Computing and Combinatorics Conference*, pages 216–225. Springer, 2010.
- [13] Anne Driemel and Sarel Har-Peled. Jaywalking your dog: Computing the Fréchet distance with short-cuts. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 42(5):1830–1866, 2013.
- [14] Anne Driemel, Amer Krivosija, and Christian Sohler. Clustering time series under the Fréchet distance. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2016, Arlington, VA, USA, January 10-12, 2016*, pages 766–785, 2016.
- [15] Anne Driemel, Jeff M Phillips, and Ioannis Psarros. The VC dimension of metric balls under Fréchet and Hausdorff distances. In *35th International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 2019)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019.
- [16] J. Gudmundsson and N. Valladares. A GPU approach to subtrajectory clustering using the Fréchet distance. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 26(4):924–937, April 2015.
- [17] Joachim Gudmundsson, Andreas Thom, and Jan Vahrenhold. Of motifs and goals: Mining trajectory data. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems, SIGSPATIAL ’12*, page 129–138, New York, NY, USA, 2012. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [18] David Haussler and Emo Welzl. Epsilon-nets and simplex range queries. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 2(2):127–151, 1987.
- [19] Jae-Gil Lee, Jiawei Han, and Kyu-Young Whang. Trajectory clustering: a partition-and-group framework. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, Beijing, China, June 12-14, 2007*, pages 593–604, 2007.
- [20] Abhinandan Nath and Erin Taylor. k-median clustering under discrete Fréchet and Hausdorff distances. In *36th International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 2020)*, volume 164, page 58, 2020.
- [21] F. T. Pokorný, K. Goldberg, and D. Kragic. Topological trajectory clustering with relative persistent homology. In *2016 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 16–23, 2016.
- [22] C. Sung, D. Feldman, and D. Rus. Trajectory clustering for motion prediction. In *2012 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pages 1547–1552, Oct 2012.
- [23] Guan Yuan, Penghui Sun, Jie Zhao, Daxing Li, and Canwei Wang. A review of moving object trajectory clustering algorithms. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 47(1):123–144, March 2016.