arXiv:2103.09308v2 [cs.CG] 14 May 2021

On Undecided LP, Clustering and Active Learning

Stav Ashur^{*}

Sariel Har-Peled[†]

May 17, 2021

Abstract

We study colored coverage and clustering problems. Here, we are given a colored point set where the points are covered by (unknown) & clusters, which are monochromatic (i.e., all the points covered by the same cluster, have the same color). The access the colors of the points (or even the points themselves) is provided indirectly via various queries (such as nearest neighbor, or separation queries). We show that if the number of clusters is a constant, one can correctly deduce the color of all the points (i.e., compute a monochromatic clustering of the points) using a polylogarithmic number of queries.

We investigate several variants of this problem, including Undecided Linear Programming, covering of points by & monochromatic balls, covering by & triangles/simplices, and terrain simplification. For the later problem, we present the first near linear time approximation algorithm. While our approximation is slightly worse than previous work, this is the first algorithm to have subquadratic complexity if the terrain has "small" complexity.

1. Introduction

Given a set of points P in \mathbb{R}^d that are labeled (say, colored as red and blue), the problem of learning a classifier that labels the points correctly is a standard machine learning question. In the active learning settings, querying/exposing the label of an input is an expensive endeavor, and one tries to minimize such queries while performing the learning task.

We are interested in a somewhat related question: If the input point set has a "simple" structure, but we are given access to the input via oracles that performs more "interesting" queries than just exposing the label of a point, can one classify correctly all the input points using relatively few oracle queries?

Implicit input model. Consider the situation where instead of the algorithm reading the input as in the classical setting, the access to the input is via *input primitives*, or *oracles*. Such indirect access to the data rises naturally if the data is already stored in a preexisting database or data-structure. This approach is of relevance nowadays as large amount of data makes even the basic task of reading the whole input infeasible or prohibitively expensive.

This gives rise to the main motivation for this work – what input primitives/oracles one needs, so that one can derive efficient algorithms. Here, of special interest are algorithms with running times that are sublinear in the input size.

Problem I: Undecided linear programs. An instance of linear programming is a set of n linear inequalities on d variables, where one needs to find an assignment of real values to the variables, such that all the inequalities hold. We consider a new variant of LP, first studied by Maass and Turán [MT90], where the n linear constraints

^{*}Department of Computer Science; University of Illinois; 201 N. Goodwin Avenue; Urbana, IL, 61801, USA; stava20illinois.edu; https://publish.illinois.edu/stav-ashur.

[†]Department of Computer Science; University of Illinois; 201 N. Goodwin Avenue; Urbana, IL, 61801, USA; sariel@illinois.edu; http://sarielhp.org/. Work on this paper was partially supported by a NSF AF award CCF-1907400.

are given, but we do not know a priori whether the inequality is \leq or \geq for each one of them. Geometrically, this corresponds to being given n hyperplanes in \mathbb{R}^d , each having two closed halfspaces associated with it. Which of the two halfspaces is the one used in the LP can be revealed by querying an oracle. For example, the "standard" *separation oracle*, which returns for a given query point p, a violated constraint of the LP, or alternatively returns that p is feasible. An example of ULP (i.e., undecided LP) is depicted in Figure 1.1.



(iii) A possible commitment of the constraints, and the feasible polygon induced.

 $y = -\frac{4}{5}x + 4$
 $y = \frac{5}{6}x_1 - 1$
 $y = -\frac{1}{6}x + 3$

(ii) ... is a set of lines in the plane.



(iv) An alternative commitment of the underlying constraints, and the induced polygon.

Figure 1.1: An instance of 3 undecided constraints (bottom) with two possible sets of underlying decided constraints (bottom left and right).

Problem II: Separating red and blue points, with a counterexample oracle. The above problem, in the dual, is the following: The input is a set of unlabeled points, and the task is to compute a hyperplane separating the blue points from the red points. The "separation" oracle here, is given an oriented hyperplane that is supposed to separate the points, and the oracle returns a misclassified point. A natural question is how many queries of this type one has to perform until classifying all the points correctly.

The learning model. Our model seems to be Angluin's equivalence query model for active learning [Ang87]. In particular, Maass and Turán [MT94b, MT94a] studied the above two problems. See Remark 2.7 for more details.

Problem III: Covering/clustering points with a ball using proximity oracle. Consider the situation where the input is a set of colored points in \mathbb{R}^d , where all the (say) red points are inside a ball, and all the points outside the ball are blue. Here, our access to the color of the points is via an oracle that can answer colored nearest-neighbor (NN) or furthest-neighbor (FN) queries (that is, the oracle can return the closest red [or blue] point to the query point). The task at hand is to label (i.e., color) the points correctly using a minimal number of oracle queries.

The challenge. To appreciate the difficulty in solving the above problem, consider the natural naive algorithm – pick a random sample, expose the colors of the points in the sample (in this case the colored NN queries can do that), compute a ball separating the red points and blue points in the sample, and feed it into the "counterexample" oracle (which returns a colored point that is on the wrong side of the ball – this oracle can be implemented using the NN/FN queries). The algorithm adds this counterexample to the current set of points whose color is known. Now the algorithm does arrive to the right answer, but it is easy to come up with examples where it has to do a linear number of iterations. As such, the challenge is to get a sublinear number of iterations.

Problem IV: Covering points by monochromatic balls. Consider the situation where the input is a set of points that can be covered by & balls (i.e., clusters) such that all the points covered by the same ball have the same label/color (i.e., red or blue). In this setting, given a query point, the oracle returns the closest point of a prespecified color. See Figure 1.2 for an example.



(A) NN (blue) oracle query marked by an "x" reveals that the points in the interior of the disk are red, and the returned point is blue.



(B) The same query with the underlying colors of the points, and an optimal solution with & = 12 monochromatic disks.

Figure 1.2: An instance of Problem IV.

Problem V: Covering points with monochromatic triangles. The input is a set of unlabeled points that can be covered by k triangles. All the points covered by the same triangle, have the same label/color (i.e., red or blue). The oracle, given a triangle and a color, returns either that (i) all the points covered by the triangle have the same color, or (ii) a point covered by the triangle is of the opposite color.

Problem VI: Terrain simplification. Here, the input is a set of points in three dimensions sampled from a terrain. For each sample point we have an associated interval in the z-axis of length 2ε with the point in its

dim	ref	RT	# queries
d = 2	Theorem 2.19	O(n)	$O(\log n)$
d = 3	Lemma 3.1	$\widetilde{O}(n^{3/2})$	$O(\log n)$
	Theorem 3.4	$\widetilde{O}(n^{1+\delta})$	$O(\delta^{-1}\log n)$
d	[MT94b, MT94a] Lemma 2.2	$n^{O(d^2)}$	$O(d^2\log n)$
	Lemma 2.2	$\widetilde{O}(n^d)$	$O(d^3 \log n)$
	Lemma 2.5	$O_d(n)$	$O_d(\log^d n)$
	Theorem 2.20	$O_d(n)$	$O_d(\log^{d-1} n)$
d > 3	Remark 3.5	$\widetilde{O}(n^{1+\delta})$	$O_d(\log^{d-2} n)$

Figure 1.3: A summary of the results on ULP. Here δ can be chosen to be any constant in (0, 1). The O_d hides constants that depends (probably exponentially or worse) on the dimension.

center, that represents the tolerated approximation error. The problem is then to compute a terrain made out of a minimal number of triangles, that passes through all the vertical error tolerance intervals of the points. This problem can be interpreted as a set cover problem with planar triangles, where a triangle is allowable only if it can be lifted to three dimensions so that it approximates the points lying in it correctly.

Related work. Linear programming has a long history, see the survey by [DMW04].

In *active learning*, also known as query learning or experimental design, the purpose of the algorithm is learning a concept by querying specific input entries for their label, and the main criteria for efficiency is minimizing the number of queries. The basic premise is that asking a specialist to label a specific example is an expensive operation. See [Set09] for a survey on the topic of active learning.

Closer to our settings, Har-Peled *et al.* [HJR20], studied algorithms for actively learning a convex body using a separation oracle. Such an oracle either confirms that that the query point is within the convex body, or alternatively, returns a hyperplane separating the point and the convex region.

Kane *et al.* [KLMZ17] studied half plane classifiers using comparison queries, and showed an exponential query complexity improvement over learning with only membership queries. Their model is somewhat similar to the model of Problem II above (of separating red and blue points), except that their model assumes that the oracle can return the distance of a query point to the optimal separating hyperplane, while our model only assumes that the oracle can identify a misclassified point.

In general, computational models that involve various oracles as algorithmic building blocks have been studied in computational geometry, as they represent algorithms in which the input is given implicitly, and access to any information provided by the input is done by oracle queries. See Har-Peled *et al.* [HKMR16] and references therein for such examples.

As mentioned above, Maass and Turán [MT94b, MT94a] studied Problems I and II – our results are better, but only in constant dimensions, see Remark 2.7 for details.

Previous work on terrain simplification. The input is a set P of n points in three dimensions, and a vertical error parameter $\tau > 0$. The purpose is to return a terrain of minimum complexity, such that each point of P is in vertical distance at most τ from the terrain. In the following, we assume that there is such a terrain made out of k triangles.

As mentioned above, one can interpret this problem as a hitting set or a set cover problem. Here, the task is to compute a collection of triangles, such that for any point of P, the vertical line through it intersects at

Cover size	Terrain size	Running time	ref
$O(\hbar \log \hbar)$	$O(k\log k)$	$O(n^8)$	Agarwal and Suri [AS98]
$O(k \log k)$	$O(\hbar^2 \log^2 \hbar)$	$O(n^{2+\varepsilon} + \hbar^3 \text{polylog})$	Agarwal and Desikan [AD97]
$O(\hbar \log n)$	$O(\hbar^2 \log^2 n)$	$O\big(n \cdot \mathscr{k}^{14} \log^{13} \mathscr{k} \log n\big)$	Theorem 5.8

Figure 1.4: Results on terrain simplification.

least one triangle, and all the triangles it intersects are in vertical distance at most τ from the point.

Agarwal and Suri [AS98] presented an algorithm that computes, in roughly $O(n^8)$ time, a terrain approximation with $O(\[mathcal{k}\] \log \[mathcal{k}\])$ triangles – their basic scheme is based on recovering via dynamic programming a BSP partition of the optimal vertical decomposition. A faster algorithm was presented by Agarwal and Desikan [AD97], with running time $O(n^{2+\varepsilon} + \[mathcal{k}\]^3)$ polylog), that outputs a set of $O(\[mathcal{k}\] \log \[mathcal{k}\])$ triangles that approximates the point set. Converting this set of triangles into terrain, results in a simplified terrain of size $O(\[mathcal{k}\]^2 \log^2 \[mathcal{k}\])$. See Figure 1.4 for summary of these results.

1.1. Our results

(A) UNDECIDED LP. We present several algorithms for solving undecided LPs. In Section 2.1, we revisit the algorithm of Maass and Turán, showing ULPs can be solved using $O(d^2 \log n)$ oracle queries. The main tool is repeatedly computing a centerpoint and feeding it to the oracle to further truncate the search space. This bound is polynomial in d, but the runtime of algorithm itself is doubly exponential in the dimension d. The running time can be improved to (roughly) $O(n^d)$, with the number of queries deteriorating to $O(d^3 \log n)$.

In Section 2.2 we present a linear time algorithm for constant dimension that uses cutting, but the number of separation oracle queries is now $O(\log^d n)$. In Section 2.3 we show that in the plane, in near linear time, one can reduce the number of queries to $O(\log n)$.

- (B) OPTIMAL ALGORITHM FOR UNDECIDED LP IN THE PLANE. In Section 2.4, we present the ultimate algorithm in the plane, that runs in linear time, and performs only logarithmic number of queries. This requires a careful combination of the previous algorithm, together with random sampling of the constraints, and an iterative refinement algorithm. This result is one of the highlights of this paper.
- (C) COVERING (RED) POINTS BY A SINGLE BALL. In Section 4.1 we study Problem III, and present an algorithm that uses $O(\log^2 n)$ colored NN/FN queries, and computes the single ball that covers (say) all the red points, and avoids all the blue points. The algorithm works by lifting the input point set to three dimensions, and then using the algorithm for undecided LP.
- (D) COVERING POINTS BY & MONOCHROMATIC BALLS. In Section 4.2 we address Problem IV above, where the input is covered by & monochromatic balls, and we have access to a colored NN oracle. Inspired by the one ball case, we show a greedy algorithm that finds a ball that covers O(1/&) faction of the uncovered points. This leads to an algorithm that performs $O(\&^{d+2}\log^{d+2}n)$ queries (see Theorem 4.9) and correctly classifies all the points.
- (E) COVERING POINTS BY & MONOCHROMATIC TRIANGLES. We are given (i) a colored set P of n points in the plane, (ii) an oracle that can report, given a triangle \triangle , whether or not the color of all points inside $\triangle \cap P$ are the same (and if so, report the color), and (iii) an oracle, such that given a partial cover by triangles, randomly returns an uncovered point. We present an algorithm that computes a cover of P by $O(\& \log n)$ monochromatic triangles, under the assumption that such a cover exists, in $k^{O(1)} \log n$ time, see Theorem 5.4 for the exact bounds. This algorithm is significantly sublinear if $k \ll n$. If we are not given the oracles, but instead are provided with the colors of the points, the oracles can be implemented, so that the resulting algorithm works in $O(nk^{O(1)} \log n)$ time.



Figure 1.5: A triangle covering only red points. The natural canonical triangle, that is induced by the subset of the points inside the original triangle, is not contained inside the original triangle (see yellow regions in the right pane).

(F) TERRAIN SIMPLIFICATION. The above algorithm applies verbatim for the problem of terrain simplification, implying a $O(n k^{O(1)} \log n)$ time algorithm for a cover of the given point set (up to the error parameter provided) by $O(k \log n)$ triangles. This can be converted into a simplified terrain of complexity $O(k^2 \log^2 n)$. All previous work [AS98, AD97] had quadratic or (much) worse running time. See Section 5.2 for details.

Technical contribution. For the undecided LP our algorithms require ways to sample vertices of an arrangement of lines/planes/hyperplanes that lies inside a polytope (that has relatively small complexity). In two dimensions we do so by using known techniques. To get a linear time algorithm requires a nontrivial combination of random sampling together with gradation type refinement approach. In three dimensions we use a rather interesting over-sampling idea that has the potential to be useful in other settings. Even in three dimensions the problem of how to sample such a vertex efficiently (i.e., linear time) remains an interesting open problem.

Another contribution of this work is a refinement of the notion of canonical ranges.

Beyond canonical sets. Underlying this work is the dichotomy between ranges, the set of input points they contain (i.e., the projection of the ranges to the set of points), and the ranges that are defined by the original set of points. As a concrete example, consider a set P of points in the plane. A triangle \triangle contains the subset of the points $P \cap \triangle$. Our purpose is to recover \triangle , or at least a triangle that contains the same subset of points of P. For example, assume that all the points of $P \cap \triangle$ are red, and the points of $P \setminus \triangle$ are blue, and we have access to the points and their colors via some oracle.

The standard approach is via *canonical triangles* – the idea being that one takes the original triangle, and morph it continuously into a new triangle, so that it contains the same subset of points (except maybe for a few points on the boundary). The new triangle (i.e., the canonical triangle corresponding to the original triangle) is now fully constrained/defined by the points on the boundary. Under general position assumption, such a triangle would have six points on its boundary, which implies that the number of different subsets of P that can be realized by triangles is $O(n^6)$.

The problem, for our purposes, is that the resulting canonical triangle is not contained inside the original triangle. This issue is illustrated in Figure 1.5. This issue becomes critical for our purposes, as we can not afford

to enumerate all canonical sets directly, because their number is prohibitive. Instead, we are interested in the triangles induced by a (small) subset/sample of the original points. To have any hope to get a query efficient algorithm, we need a way for the sample to induce triangles that are contained inside the original (unknown!) triangle, while containing a large fraction of the sample points.

To this end, we define a new process of defining alternative triangles – which we refer to as *self-defined* triangles. The newly defined triangle have the desired property that they are strictly contained inside the unknown original triangle, while containing a significant fraction of the points contained inside it. See Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2 for details.

This issue might seem as tedium, but it is the technical insight needed to "unlock" random sampling and to be able to use it for terrain approximation. This results in the first near linear time algorithm for terrain simplification, as all previous work required quadratic (or worse) running time. We believe our approach should be useful for other problems.

The idea of covering canonical sets by a few sets, that belong to a special family of sets (which is much smaller than the original family of canonical sets) is by now standard – see for example the work of Aronov *et al.* [AES10]. Despite the superficial similarly, this is distinct from the self-defined sets/triangles we introduce.

2. Algorithms for solving undecided linear programs

Remark 2.1. All the algorithms described below for undecided LP work in the same fashion – they generate a sequence of separation oracle queries. Specifically, if any of the query points are feasible, the algorithm immediately stops and outputs that the ULP is feasible with the queried point as a proof. For the clarity of description in the following, we always assume a separation oracle returns a separating hyperplane.

2.1. Centerpoint based algorithm for solving ULPs

We review the algorithm of Maass and Turán [MT94b, MT94a] for solving undecided LP (they did not provide running time bounds for their algorithm, which we do).

Observe that for a set of d-dimensional (closed) hyperplanes H, if there exists a feasible point, then, under general position assumption, there exists a vertex of the arrangement $\mathcal{A}(H)$ that is feasible.

Let P be a set of n points in \mathbb{R}^d . For a parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, a point $c \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an α -centerpoint if all halfspaces containing c also contain at least αn points of P. A classical implication of Helly's theorem, is that for any set P of n points in \mathbb{R}^d , there is a 1/(d+1)-centerpoint. Such a point is simply a centerpoint of P, and can be computed in $O(n^{d-1})$ time [JM94, Cha04]. A $2/d^2$ -centerpoint can be computed in near linear time [HJ19] (here, the running time is polynomial in d).

The algorithm. The input is a set H of n hyperplanes in d dimensions. The first step of the algorithm is to compute the set P of vertices of the arrangement $\mathcal{A}(H)$. The number of such vertices is $\leq \binom{n}{d}$. As long as P has more than $d^2 \log n$ points, the algorithm computes a centerpoint c of P. The algorithm then queries the separation oracle on c in order to decide whether c is feasible. If it is, then the algorithm is done, as it computed a feasible point. Otherwise, the oracle returned a violated constraint of the given LP (this also provides the algorithm with the direction of the constraint for the associated input hyperplane). The algorithm removes all the points of P that violate this constraint, and repeats until $|P| = O(d^2 \log n)$. Once P is that small, the algorithm simply checks the feasibility of each of the remaining vertices by querying it with the separation oracle.

Lemma 2.2. The above algorithm computes a feasible point of H using $O(d^2 \log n)$ separation oracle queries. The running time of this algorithm, ignoring the oracle calls, is $O(n^{d(d-1)})$ time.

Alternatively, the algorithm can be modified so that it computes a feasible point using $O(d^3 \log n)$ separation oracle queries. The running time of this algorithm, ignoring the oracle calls, is $\tilde{O}(n^d)$ time, where \tilde{O} hides polylogarithmic terms.

Proof: Let $m_0 = \binom{n}{d}$ be the number of vertices in $\mathcal{A}(H)$. Every centerpoint computation and the following oracle call reduces the number of vertices by a factor of 1 - 1/(d+1). As such, after $O((d+1)\log_2\binom{n}{d}) = O(d^2\log n)$ iterations the algorithm is done.

Computing all of the vertices of $\mathcal{A}(H)$ takes $O(n^d)$ time. Computing a centerpoint takes $O(n^{d(d-1)})$ time [JM94, Cha04]. Repeating this d + 1 times, reduces the number of active points by a constant factor, and the overall running time is thus bounded by $\sum_{i=0}^{\lg n} O(d(n/2^i)^{d(d-1)}) = O(dn^{d(d-1)})$.

As for the modified algorithm, let P be the set of vertices of the arrangement $\mathcal{A}(H)$. Let $m_0 = |P|$. In the *i*th iteration, we use the algorithm of Har-Peled and Jones [HJ19] that computes a $O(1/d^2)$ -centerpoint of P in $d^{O(1)} \log^6 n$ time, with high probability. We now use this centerpoint in the above algorithm instead of the exact 1/(d+1)-centerpoint. The bounds stated readily follow, as it takes $O(d^2)$ iterations to halve the number of active points, and the bottleneck in the running time of the algorithm is computing P initially.

2.2. Cutting based algorithm

Here, we present the new algorithm to solve undecided LP using cuttings.

Definition 2.3. For a set of n d-dimensional hyperplanes H, a 1/r-cutting of H is a partition Ξ of \mathbb{R}^d into $O(r^d)$ simplices, such that the interior of each simplex of the cutting intersects at most n/r hyperplanes of H. The list of hyperplanes intersecting the interior of a simplex $\nabla \in \Xi$, is the conflict list of ∇ .

A 1/r-cutting, and its conflict list can be computed in $O(nr^{d-1})$ time [Har11].

Remark 2.4. The algorithm we present next call itself recursively on subsets of the constraints, and on lower dimensional subspaces. In particular, the oracle can be applied to any lower dimensional affine subspace F by using the original oracle in the ambient space – a returned constraint can be intersected with F to get a constraint in F. We emphasize that the oracle always works on the whole original input set of constraints – the recursive calls on subsets of the constraints are done for efficient bookkeeping, and do not effect how the oracle works.

The Algorithm. The algorithm computes a 1/r-cutting of H. Let Ξ be this set of simplices, and let $\Xi_{d-1}(\Xi)$ be the set of $O(r^d)$ (d-1)-dimensional simplices that form the faces of the simplices of Ξ . The algorithm now solves the problem recursively on each of the (d-1)-dimensional simplices of $\Xi_{d-1}(\Xi)$, and the hyperplanes of H that intersects it. Each recursive call is on a problem that is one dimensional lower, and involves only n/r constraints. The oracle still applies to the whole set of constraints, see Remark 2.4.

If any of these recursive calls finds a feasible point, then we are done. Otherwise, the recursive calls performed involved calls to the oracle, and forced some of the constraints to expose themselves. Let C be the set of these committed halfspaces (i.e., all the halfspaces returned by the separation oracle). If the intersection of all these constraints is empty (i.e., the associated LP is infeasible), then this can be discovered, in O(|C|) time, by invoking a standard LP solver on C. If the LP is feasible, then it returns us a point p inside the polytope

$$\mathcal{K} = \bigcap_{h^+ \in \mathcal{C}} h^+.$$

Furthermore, this polytope must be fully contained in the interior of one of the simplices of Ξ (otherwise, the algorithm would have found a feasible point in one of the recursive calls). By scanning Ξ , we discover the simplex $\nabla \in \Xi$ that contains p. The algorithm now call recursively on ∇ and its conflict list (passing C as the current set of committed constraints).

Algorithm in one dimension. The 1-dimensional case is solved using a binary search. We have n uncommitted rays on the real line, and our purpose is to find an atomic interval that is feasible. To this end, the algorithm computes a median among the points defined by the rays, and then asks the oracle to commit the



Cells of a cutting of an arrangement of undecided constraints.



A single cell of the cutting might contain a possibly feasible region in its interior.

Figure 2.1: Illustration of an iteration of the cutting-based algorithm. A cutting of an arrangement of undecided constraints is depicted on the left. After solving the problem recursively on the cuttings of the edges, some of the constraints are now committed. The feasible region (the red polygon) induced by the constraints is a polygon that must be fully contained in one of the cells of the cutting.

direction of the appropriate ray. This decreases the number of potential atomic intervals that might be feasible by half. At the end of the process, the algorithm is left with a single atomic interval that might be feasible – the algorithm asks the oracle whether the middle of this interval is feasible or not.

As such, after $O(\log n)$ iterations, the algorithm is done, as each iteration either finds a feasible point, or throws away half of the rays. The running time is O(n), and the number of oracle queries performed is $O(\log n)$.

Analysis: Number of oracle queries. The query complexity of this algorithm is

$$Q_d(n) = O(r^d)Q_{d-1}\left(\frac{n}{r}\right) + Q_d\left(\frac{n}{r}\right),$$

with $Q_1(n) = O(\log n)$. The solution of this recurrence is $O(\log^d n)$, for r chosen to be a sufficiently large constant. Indeed, using induction, we have $Q_d(n) = O(r^d \log^{d-1} \frac{n}{r}) + Q_d(\frac{n}{r})$,

Running time. As for the running time, we have

$$T_d(n) = O(nr^{d-1}) + O(r^d)T_{d-1}(n/r) + T_d(n/r)$$

with $T_1(n) = O(n)$. Assuming $T_{d-1}(n) \leq c_{d-1}n$, and for two constants c'_d and c''_d , we have

$$T_d(n) \le c'_d n r^{d-1} + c''_d r^d c_{d-1} \frac{n}{r} + c_d \frac{n}{r} \le \left(c'_d r^{d-1} + c''_d r^{d-1} c_{d-1} + \frac{c_d}{r}\right) n \le c_d n,$$

which holds if $c_d \ge 2(c'_d r^{d-1} + c''_d r^{d-1} c_{d-1})$. This implies that $T_d(n) = O(n)$. We thus get the following result.

Lemma 2.5. Undecided LP with n constraints in \mathbb{R}^d , can be solved in $O_d(n)$ time, using $O(\log^d n)$ separation oracle queries.

Remark 2.6 (An implicit undecided LP). In the following, we need a variant of the above problem – the input is a set of undecided constraints, but the real undecided LP instance \mathcal{I} corresponds to an (unknown) subset of these constraints. Fortunately, the given separation oracle works on the "real" instance of constraints \mathcal{I} . It is easy to verify that the above algorithm of Lemma 2.5 works verbatim in this case.

Remark 2.7. The work of Maass and Turán [MT94b, MT94a] also studied the dual settings of our problem (i.e., Problem II of separating red and blue points). They assume the input points are taken from a grid of bounded spread, and use the ellipsoid algorithm to get an efficient algorithm with a small number of queries.

2.3. Near linear time algorithm in two dimensions

2.3.1. VC dimension of polygons

Lemma 2.8. Let L be a set of n lines in \mathbb{R}^2 , and let \mathcal{D}^k be the set of all convex polygons that have a boundary made out of at most k edges or rays. For a polygon $D \in \mathcal{D}^k$, let $D \sqcap L = \{h \in L \mid h \cap \operatorname{int}(D) \neq \emptyset\}$, and consider the range space $\mathsf{S}^k = (L, \{D \sqcap L \mid D \in \mathcal{D}^k\})$. The VC dimension of S^k is $O(k \log k)$.

Proof: The VC dimension of $S_s = (H, \{s \sqcap H \mid s \text{ is a segment}\})$ is O(1), being the dual of the range space of points, with the ranges being double-wedges. For a polygon $D \in \mathcal{D}^k$, let E(D) be the set of segments and rays forming its boundary. Observe that $h \in H$ intersects the interior of $D \iff h$ intersects the interior of one of the segments/rays of E(D). Namely, a range of S^k is the union of at most k ranges of S_s . By standard bounds on the VC dimension of combined range spaces [Har11], we have that the VC dimension of S^k is bounded by $O(k \log k)$.

We need the following lemma, due to Har-Peled and Mitchell [HJ20].

Lemma 2.9 ([HJ20]). Let D be a fixed polygon with k edges, and let L be a set of m lines that intersect the interior of D. After $O(m(\log k + \log m))$ preprocessing, one can compute the number of vertices of $\mathcal{A}(L)$ that lie inside D, or sample such a vertex in $O(\log m)$ time.

2.3.2. Polygon and point set reduction

Polygon reduction.

Lemma 2.10. Consider an instance of undecided LP in the plane, and a polygon D with t edges, such that the feasible region is contained in D. Using $O(\log t)$ separation queries, and O(t) time, one can either compute a feasible point, or compute a polygon $D' \subseteq D$ with (say) at most 10 edges, such that the feasible region must be contained in D'.

Proof: Let $D_1 = D$ and $t_1 = t$. As long as the current polygon D_i has more than 10 edges, compute a centerpoint p_i to the vertices of D_i . Next, using a separation oracle query, decide if p_i is feasible. If it is, the algorithm is done. Otherwise, the oracle returns a halfplane h^+ that must contain the feasible solution, such that $p_i \notin h^+$. This implies that $D_{i+1} \leftarrow D_i \cap h^+$ has at most $t_{i+1} \leq (2/3)t_i + 2$ vertices. The algorithm continues to the next iteration.

Clearly, after $O(\log t)$ iterations, the current polygon has less than 10 vertices, and the algorithm returns it as the desired polygon D'. The running time follows as the centerpoint can be computed in the plane in linear time, and the number of vertices of the polygon reduces by a constant fraction at each iteration.

Point set reduction via centerpoint.

Lemma 2.11. Consider an instance of undecided LP in \mathbb{R}^d , and a set P of n points. In O(n) time, using $O(\log n)$ separation oracle queries, one can compute either: (i) a feasible point for the ULP, or alternatively, (ii) a polytope D with $O(d^2 \log n)$ faces, such that the feasible solution for the ULP lies inside D, and D contains no point of P.

In two dimensions, one can modify the algorithm so that the number of edges of D is at most 10.

Proof: We apply the same centerpoint reduction idea used above. Let $P_1 = P$. In the beginning of the *i*th iteration, the algorithm computes a $O(1/d^2)$ -centerpoint p_i for P_i by using the algorithm of Har-Peled and Jones [HJ19], which works in $d^{O(1)} \log^6 n$ time (and succeeds with high probability).

Next, using a separation oracle query, the algorithm decides if p_i is feasible. If so, the algorithm is done. Otherwise, the algorithm removes all the points of P_i that are on the same side of the returned hyperplane (or line in 2d) as p_i , sets P_{i+1} to be the resulting point set, and continues to the next iteration. Since $|P_{i+1}| \leq$ $(1 - O(1/d^2))|P_i| + O(d)$, the algorithm ends up with a set containing a constant number of points after $O(d^2 \log n)$ iterations. The algorithm uses the separation oracle on each of he remaining points to eliminate them. Finally, the returned polytope is the intersection of all the constraints returned by the separation oracle. Since the algorithm uses $O(1 + \log n)$ separation queries, the bound on the complexity of the output polytope follows.

To get the improved algorithm in the plane, the algorithm of Lemma 2.10 is executed on the resulting polygon to further reduce the number of its edges to 10.

2.3.3. Near linear running time in two dimensions

Let L be the input set of n lines (i.e., undecided constraints). Let $L_0 = L$, and $D_0 = \mathbb{R}^2$.

Let V_i denote the set of vertices of $\mathcal{A}(L_{i-1})$ that lie in D_{i-1} . The algorithm computes $n_i = |V_i|$ using the algorithm of Lemma 2.9. There are three possibilities:

- (A) If $n_i = 0$, then the algorithm picks any point p_i in D_{i-1} , and calls the separation oracle on p_i . If p_i is feasible, the algorithm is done, otherwise, the algorithm returns that the given instance is infeasible.
- (B) If $n_i = O(n \log n)$, the algorithm computes V_i by clipping the lines of L to D_{i-1} , and computing the arrangement of the resulting segments. This takes $O(n \log n + n_i)$ expected time, as this is the time required for computing the arrangement of n segments with n_i intersections.

The algorithm uses Lemma 2.11 on V_i to either find a feasible point, or a polygon D'_1 that must contain the feasible region, has at most 10 edges, and contains no point of V_i .

(C) Otherwise, the algorithm samples O(n) vertices from V_i , and sets R_i to be the resulting sample. This is done using the algorithm of Lemma 2.9 in $O(n \log n)$ time. Next, the algorithm applies, as above, Lemma 2.11 and Lemma 2.10 to get a constant complexity polygon $D_i \subseteq D_{i-1}$ that does not contain any of the points of R_i .

The algorithm now scans the lines of L_{i-1} , computes the set of all lines $L_i \subseteq L_{i-1}$ that intersect D_i , and continues to the next iteration.

Lemma 2.12. The above algorithm solves two dimensional undecided LP in expected $O(n \log n)$ time, using $O(\log n)$ separation oracle queries.

Proof: All the edges of the current polygon D_i are contained in lines of L. As such, when D_i contains no vertex of $\mathcal{A}(L)$, then it must be a face of the arrangement, and thus (A) applies, and the result it reports is correct.

Now, R_i is a sample of O(n) vertices from V_i . Constant complexity convex polygons have constant VC dimension by Lemma 2.8, As such, R_i is an ε -net for V_i , where $\varepsilon = O((\log n)/n)$. Since D_i has constant complexity and does not contain any point of V_i , it follows that it contains at most $\varepsilon |V_i|$ vertices of $\mathcal{A}(L)$. We conclude that $n_{i+1} \leq \varepsilon n_i$. Clearly, after three such iterations, the algorithm has no vertices left, and the algorithm is done.

Finally, since each iteration takes $O(n \log n)$ expected time, the claim follows.

2.4. A linear time algorithm with logarithmic number of queries in two dimensions

Let L be a set of n undecided constraints in the plane (i.e., lines) as before.

The algorithm. The algorithm samples a set R of $\Theta(n/\log n)$ lines from L, by picking each line with probability $p = c/\log n$ for some appropriate constant c. The algorithm then computes a polygon D_0 with at most 10 edges that contains no vertex of $\mathcal{A}(R)$ by using the algorithm of Lemma 2.12 on R. Note that the oracle queries are still done on the original set of constraints L.

Let L_0 be the set of all the lines of L that intersect the interior of D_0 . Formally, we have

$$L_0 = L \sqcap D_0 = \left\{ \ell \in L \mid \ell \cap \operatorname{int}(D_0) \neq \emptyset \right\}.$$

.



Figure 2.2: An illustration of the steps composing an iteration of the algorithm described in Section 2.4. (A) Compute a polygon with no arrangement vertices (B) find a separating cell D'_i of the subpolygons created by R_{i-1} (C) compute the intersection points P_i of the lines L_{i-1} with D'_i (D) compute D''_i using Lemma 2.11 (E) get D_i from the intersection of D''_i and D_{i-1} .

Similarly, let $R_0 = R \sqcap D_0$.

For i > 0, in the *i*th iteration the algorithm computes the segments formed by the intersections of the lines of R_{i-1} with D_{i-1} . These segments are interior disjoint, and they partition D_{i-1} into $m_i + 1$ subpolygons, where $m_{i-1} = |R_{i-1}|$, see Figure 2.2. The dual of the subpolygons is a tree, and there is a vertex which, when removed, breaks the polygon into parts such that each part contains at most $(2/3)(m_{i-1} + 1)$ original subpolygons – this separating vertex can be computed in linear time in the tree size. This vertex corresponds to a subpolygon D'_i that has O(1) edges. The algorithm computes all the intersections of the lines of L_{i-1} with the boundary of D'_i , and sets P_i to be the resulting set of points. The algorithm then uses Lemma 2.11 on P_i in order to get a constant complexity polygon D''_i that contains the feasible region, and does not contain any point of P_i . This requires $O(\log |P_i|)$ queries. (If D''_i does not intersect D_{i-1} , then the given instance is infeasible, and the algorithm can stop.)

The boundary of the polygon D''_i does not intersect the boundary of the polygon D'_i . As such, D''_i either

- (i) intersects only one of the parts of $D_{i-1} \setminus D'_i$, and the algorithm sets this part to be D_i , or
- (ii) $D''_i \subset D'_i$, and the algorithm then sets $D_i = D'_i$.

The algorithm next computes $L_i = D_i \sqcap L_{i-1}$ and $R_i = D_i \cap R_{i-1}$ and continues to the next iteration.

As soon as $|L_i| = O(n/\log n)$, the algorithm stop the iterations, and calls the algorithm of Lemma 2.12 on L_i (and D_i as the region containing the feasible solution), in order to find the feasible solution for the original instance, if it exists.

2.4.1. Analysis

A polygon \widehat{D} is *supported* by L, if \widehat{D} is the union of some faces of the arrangement $\mathcal{A}(L)$. All the polygons computed by the above algorithms are supported by L.

Lemma 2.13. For all *i*, the polygons D_i and D'_i have at most 20 vertices.

Proof: Observe that D_0 has at most 10 edges, as it was computed by the algorithm of Lemma 2.12. The polygon D_i is the result of taking D_0 , partitioning it along some of the lines of R, and picking one of the pieces. By construction, the arrangement $\mathcal{A}(R)$ has no vertex inside D_0 .

An edge of D_i is either a subsegment of an original edge of D_0 , or alternatively, it connects two points that lie on two original edges of D_0 . As the edges of D_i must alternate between original edges and new edges, it follows that D_i has at most 20 edges/vertices.

The same argument applies verbatim to D'_i .

Lemma 2.14. The boundaries of the polygons D'_i and D''_i do not intersect.

Proof: As noted above, both D'_i and D''_i are supported by L. In particular, all their vertices are vertices of $\mathcal{A}(L)$. As such, P_i is the set of all vertices of $\mathcal{A}(L)$ that lie on $\partial D'_i$. If a feasible point was found during the execution of the algorithm used to compute D''_i , then the algorithm would have stopped. As such, all the oracle queries returned (closed) halfspaces (defined by lines of L), and the intersection of these half-spaces (i.e., D''_i) does not contain any vertex of P_i . If the boundaries of D'_i and D''_i intersect, then this intersection would contain a point of P_i , which is a contradiction.

The following is an immediate consequence of Chernoff's inequality, and we omit the easy proof.

Lemma 2.15. We have $pn/2 \le m_0 = |R| \le 2pn = O(n/\log n)$ with high probability.

Lemma 2.16. The polygon D_i intersects at most $n_i = |L_i| = O((2/3)^i n)$ lines of L with high probability, as long as $(2/3)^i \ge 1/n^{1/3}$. In particular, the algorithm performs $O(\log \log n)$ iterations with high probability.

Proof: We have that $m_0 = |R|$, and $m_i = |R \sqcap D_i| = |R_i \sqcap D_i| \le (2/3)m_{i-1} + O(1)$. As such, we have $m_i = O((2/3)^i n/\log n)$, as $m_0 = O(n/\log n)$. Consider an ε -approximation for L, where the ranges are polygons with at most 20 vertices. By Lemma 2.8, this range space has VC dimension O(1), and by setting

$$\varepsilon = \frac{c' \log n}{\sqrt{n}},$$

we get that the sample R is an ε -approximation of size $O(\varepsilon^{-2} \log \varepsilon^{-1}) = O(n/\log n)$, and this holds with high probability. As n = |L|, we have

$$\left|\frac{|L_i|}{|L|} - \frac{|R_i|}{|R|}\right| \le \varepsilon \implies \frac{|L_i|}{n} \le \frac{|R_i|}{|R|} + \varepsilon \implies |L_i| \le \frac{n|R_i|}{|R|} + \varepsilon n \implies |L_i| \le \frac{n|R_i|}{pn/2} + \varepsilon n = O(|R_i|/p) + \varepsilon n.$$

This implies that

$$n_i = |L_i| \le \varepsilon n + O(m_i/p) = O(\sqrt{n}\log n + (2/3)^i n) = O((2/3)^i n).$$

The second claim follows, as the algorithm stops as soon as $n_i = O((2/3)^i n) = O(n/\log n)$, for $i = O(\log \log n)$.

Lemma 2.17. With high probability, for all i = 1, ..., h, we have $|P_i| = O(\log^2 n)$. As such, the number of oracle queries performed in each iteration is $O(\log \log n)$.

Proof: Consider a segment s that does not intersect any line of R. The sample R can be interpreted as an ε -net for the ground set of lines L, where the ranges are segments, and $\varepsilon = O((\log^2 n)/n)$, as $O(\varepsilon^{-1} \log \varepsilon^{-1}) = O(n/\log n)$.

The interior of the polygon D'_i intersects no line of R (i.e., R_{i-1}). This polygon has at most 20 edges by Lemma 2.13. The ε -net property implies that every edge of D'_i intersects at most εn lines of L (infinitesimally move the edge inward so that it no longer lies on a line of R). As such, the interior of D'_i , can intersect at most $O(20\varepsilon n) = O(\log^2 n)$ lines of L. Furthermore, for all i, we have that $|P_i| = O(\log^2 n)$, as each segment that intersects the interior of D'_i contributes two vertices to P_i .

As for the second part, the algorithm of Lemma 2.11 performs $O(\log |P_i|) = O(\log \log n)$ oracle queries on P_i , as claimed.

Lemma 2.18. The running time of the above algorithm is O(n) with high probability, and performs $O(\log \log n)$ iterations.

Proof: We have that $m_0 = O(n/\log n)$. As such, the two invocations of Lemma 2.12 takes O(n) time.

The (i + 1)th iteration of the algorithm takes $R_i = O(m_i \log m_i + n_i + |P_i|) = O(m_i \log m_i + n_i)$ time since D_i has constant complexity, and thus computing L_i takes linear time in $|L_{i-1}|$.

By Lemma 2.16, the algorithm needs to perform $h = O(\log \log n)$ iterations till $n_i = O(n/\log n)$. Since $m_i \leq (2/3)m_{i-1} + O(1)$, and $n_i = O((2/3)^i n)$, it follows that $\sum_{i=1}^h O(R_i) = O(m_0 \log m_0 + n) = O(n)$, as claimed.

Theorem 2.19. Undecided LP with n constraints in \mathbb{R}^2 , can be solved in O(n) expected time, using $O(\log n)$ separation oracle queries. These guarantees hold with high probability.

Proof: The only missing part is bounding the overall number of queries – the two invocations of the algorithm of Lemma 2.12 require $O(\log n)$ oracle queries. The $O(\log \log n)$ iterations require $O(\log \log n)$ oracle queries each. Putting the two together we get that the overall number of queries is $O(\log n + (\log \log n)^2) = O(\log n)$.

Combining the above algorithm with the cutting based algorithm of Lemma 2.5, results in the following improved theorem.

Theorem 2.20. Undecided LP with n constraints in \mathbb{R}^d , for $d \geq 2$, can be solved in $O_d(n)$ time, using $O(\log^{d-1} n)$ separation oracle queries. These guarantees hold with high probability.

3. A query efficient algorithm for ULP in three dimensions

3.1. Emulating the two dimensional algorithm

In three dimensions, one can still get $O(\log n)$ queries, albeit with running time $\widetilde{O}(n^{3/2})$.

The input is a set H of n planes in three dimensions. The algorithm randomly samples a set V_1 of

$$T = \Theta(n^{3/2} \log^3 n \sqrt{\log \log n})$$

vertices of $\mathcal{A}(H)$. Each vertex is generated by randomly choosing three constraints (planes) from H, and computing their intersection. Using the algorithm of Lemma 2.11, one computes a convex polytope \mathcal{K}_1 with $O(\log n)$ faces, which does not contain any vertex of V_1 (since Lemma 2.11 returns the $O(\log n)$ halfspaces whose intersection forms the desired polytope, the polytope itself can be computed in $O(\log n \log \log n)$ time from the returned planes).

Next, the algorithm computes all the vertices of $\mathcal{A}(H)$ inside \mathcal{K}_1 – this can be done in an output sensitive fashion. To this end, one "walks" around the arrangement of $\mathcal{A}(H)$, starting (say) with the bottom vertex of \mathcal{K}_1 . Specifically, one walks on edges of the arrangement (inside \mathcal{K}_1) using the data-structure of Chan [Cha19], which provide dynamic maintenance of convex-hull in three dimensions, and extreme point queries. Here the data-structure is used in the dual settings, where it maintains dynamically a set of planes and answers ray shooting queries. Each operation takes $O(\log^4 n)$ amortized time. The exact details of this exploration are somewhat delicate, but straightforward, and we omit them as they are similar in nature to the 2d algorithms (see [Har00] and references therein). Let V_2 be the resulting set of vertices.

Now, invoking (again) the algorithm of Lemma 2.11, one can compute a polytope \mathcal{K}_2 that contains no vertex of V_2 . The algorithm computes the polytope $\mathcal{K}_1 \cap \mathcal{K}_2$ (in polylogarithmic time). If the intersection is empty then the given instance is infeasible. Otherwise, the algorithm query a point inside this intersection using the separation oracle. If the point is feasible then the algorithm is done, and otherwise the instance is infeasible.

Lemma 3.1. The above algorithm solves Undecided LP with n constraints in \mathbb{R}^3 , using $O(\log n)$ separation oracle queries, in $O(T) = O(n^{3/2} \log^3 n \sqrt{\log \log n})$ time.

Proof: Let $\varepsilon = \Omega(\sqrt{\log \log n}/(n^{3/2} \log n))$. The argument of Lemma 2.8, implies that the VC dimension of polytopes in \mathbb{R}^3 with k faces is $O(k \log k)$. In our case, $k = O(\log n)$, and as V_1 is a random sample of size T, which can be interpreted as an ε -net, as

$$\Theta\Big(\frac{k\log k}{\varepsilon}\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\Big) = \Theta\Big(\frac{\log n\log\log n}{\varepsilon}\log n\Big) = \Theta\Big(n^{3/2}\log^3 n\sqrt{\log\log n}\Big) = \Theta(T).$$

Thus, with high probability, by the ε -net theorem, \mathcal{K}_1 (which avoids all the vertices of V_1), contains at most εn^3 vertices. That is, $|V_2| \leq \varepsilon n^3$. Computing V_2 thus takes $O(|V_2| \log^4 n) = O(\varepsilon n^3 \log^4 n) = O(T)$ time.

Since the algorithm invokes Lemma 2.11 twice, the number of oracle queries it performs is $O(\log n)$.

3.2. A faster algorithm

In the following, we assume that the set of planes of H is in general position – no three planes pass through a common line, and no four planes have a common intersection point.

Idea. A natural approach for getting a faster algorithm is to maintain a polytope \mathcal{K}_{i-1} , sample an ε -net for the vertices of the arrangement inside \mathcal{K}_{i-1} (for an ε to yet be specified), and use the algorithm of Lemma 2.10 to find a low complexity polytope that avoids all the points in this ε -net. Intersecting this polytope with the previous active polytope, results in a shrunken feasible region \mathcal{K}_i . Furthermore, \mathcal{K}_i contains an ε -fraction of the vertices of the arrangement inside it compared to \mathcal{K}_{i-1} . The algorithm then continues to the next iteration, till the polytope contains no vertices of the arrangement, and then a single query in its interior settles the feasibility of the given ULP.

The challenge is that despite \mathcal{K}_i being simple (i.e., having few faces), we do not know how to sample uniformly and efficiently from $\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{K}_i$, where $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}(H)$ is the set of vertices of $\mathcal{A}(H)$. Instead, we offer the following over-sampling approach.

Lemma 3.2. Let \mathcal{K} be a polytope in three dimensions with k faces, and let H be a set of n planes, where all the faces of \mathcal{K} lie on planes of H. One can sample a non-empty set X of at most n-1 vertices, such that (i) $X \subseteq \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{K}$, where $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}(H)$, and the probability of any vertex of $\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{K}$ to be included in the sample is the same.

The preprocessing time of the algorithm is $O(nk \log n)$, and a sampled set can be computed in O(n) time.

Proof: A line of the arrangement $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(H)$ is the intersection of two planes of H. The idea is to randomly and uniformly pick a line of \mathcal{A} that intersects \mathcal{K} , and add all the vertices along this line that are in \mathcal{K} , to the set X (observe that two intersections of this line with the boundary of polytope are in X). If there are t lines of \mathcal{A} that intersect \mathcal{K} , then the probability of a vertex of $\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{K}$ to be picked is exactly 3/t.

Consider a 2d face f of $\partial \mathcal{K}$. It forms a convex polygon in the plane $h \in H$ that supports it. Every line of \mathcal{A} that intersects f and the interior of \mathcal{K} does it in a vertex in the interior of f (i.e., formed by the intersection of the lines and the plane supporting f). The idea is to pick such a vertex uniformly at random.

To this end, the algorithm computes the number vertices of \mathcal{A} in the interior of f in $O(n \log n)$ time using Lemma 2.9. As such, in $O(nk \log n)$ time, one can compute the number of vertices of \mathcal{A} that lie in the interior of the faces of \mathcal{K} . In addition, every face has the set of all planes that intersect its interior, which defines a set of lines, and can also be computed in $O(nk \log n)$ time overall, for all the faces of the polytope. This leaves the O(k) lines supporting the edges of the polytope, which can be computed as its own set explicitly. We thus have O(k) disjoint sets of lines of the arrangement, that cover all the lines intersecting \mathcal{K} (some of these sets are implicit), and furthermore, we know the size of each set. We now randomly choose one of the sets by assigning each set probability proportional to its size, and then sample a line from the set uniformly. (Here, in the sets defining interior vertices to faces, each vertex has weight 1/2 as two vertices define a single line.)

The only non-trivial case is when the algorithm picks a vertex in uniform from the interior of a face. This can be done in $O(\log n)$ time using the precomputed data-structure of Lemma 2.9 for this face. Once the vertex is chosen, we know the two planes that induce it, and thus the line that had been chosen.

Once the line had been chosen, computing the vertices along it can be done in linear time by intersecting it with all the planes of \mathcal{K} , and keeping only the vertices on the interval on the line that lies inside \mathcal{K} .

Lemma 3.3. Let $\delta \in (0,1)$ be a fixed constant, let \mathcal{K} be a polytope in three dimensions with $t = O(\log n)$ faces, and let H be a set of n planes, where all the faces of \mathcal{K} lie on planes of H. Let $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}(H) \cap \mathcal{K}$ be the set of vertices of $\mathcal{A}(H)$ that lie inside \mathcal{K} . One can compute a polytope \mathcal{K}' , that is the intersection of \mathcal{K} with $O(\log n)$ halfspaces, such that \mathcal{K}' contains at most $|\mathcal{V}|/n^{\delta}$ vertices of $\mathcal{A}(H)$. The algorithm runs in $O(n^{1+\delta}\log^3 n\log\log n)$ time, and uses $O(\log n)$ separation oracle queries.

Proof: Let $\varepsilon = 1/n^{\delta}$. An ε -net of \mathcal{V} for polytopes with $O(\log^2 n)$ faces, requires a sample of size

$$m = O\left(\frac{\log^2 n \log \log n}{\varepsilon} \log n\right) = O(n^{\delta} \log^3 n \log \log n)$$

(this sample works with high probability). We invoke the over-sampling algorithm of Lemma 3.2, m times for $k = O(\log^2 n)$. This takes $O(nk \log n + mn) = O(n^{1+\delta} \log^3 n \log \log n)$ time, and results in a set Y of $O(nm) \approx n^{1+\delta}$ points, that is super-set of an ε -net (i.e., with high probability the set contains an ε -net) for polytopes with $O(\log^2 n)$ faces.

Next, we invoke the algorithm of Lemma 2.11, to compute a polytope with $O(\log n)$ faces that does not contain any member of Y. Let \mathcal{K}' be the intersection of \mathcal{K} with this polytope. As \mathcal{K}' has $O(\log^2 n)$ faces, it follows by the ε -net theorem that \mathcal{K}' contains at most $\varepsilon |\mathcal{V}|$ vertices of $\mathcal{A}(H)$ in it with high probability, as desired.

Starting with \mathbb{R}^3 as the initial polytope, the algorithm repeatedly uses Lemma 3.3 to reduce the number of vertices of the arrangement inside the current polytope by a factor of $1/n^{\delta}$. In the *i*th iteration, the current polytope has $O(i \log n)$ faces, and as such the final polytope has at most $O((3/\delta) \log n)$ faces, as the algorithm has no vertices in it after $\lceil 3/\delta \rceil$ iterations. We conclude the following.

Theorem 3.4. For any $\delta \in (0,1)$, an instance of undecided LP in three dimensions with n constraints, can be solved using $O((\log n)/\delta)$ separation oracle queries, in $O(n^{1+\delta}\log^4 n \log \log n)$ time.

Remark 3.5. (A) Combining the algorithm of Lemma 2.5, together with the algorithm of Theorem 3.4, when the dimension is three, results in an algorithm that solves ULP in d > 3 dimensions, with $O(\delta^{-1} \log^{d-2} n)$ separation queries, and running time $\tilde{O}(n^{1+\delta})$.

(B) Theorem 3.4 can be further improved by reducing the complexity of the active polytope after every iteration. This only improves the running time by a polylogarithmic factor, and we omit the details for the sake of simplicity of exposition.

4. Covering points by monochromatic balls using proximity queries

4.1. Learning a single monochromatic ball using NN/FN queries

Problem statement. The input is a set $P = \{p_1, ..., p_n\}$ of *n* points in \mathbb{R}^d . The points are either blue or red, but their color is not initially provided. We have access to a nearest-neighbor (NN) oracle, such that given a query point and a color, it returns the closest point of this color to the query point. Similarly, we are given access to a furthest-neighbor (FN) oracle, that returns the furthest point of this color in *P*.

The task at hand is to correctly classify all the given points as either red or blue, minimizing the number of queries used.

Single ball. Here, the assumption is that all the red points in P are inside a single ball, while all the blue points are outside. Our purpose here is to develop an efficient algorithm that performs as few oracle queries as possible, and decodes the color of all the points of P.



Figure 4.1: A set of red and blue points in \mathbb{R}^2 where a single disk suffices to separate the labels. A red furthestneighbor (FN) query and a blue nearest-neighbor (NN) query at q confirms that a monochromatic disk centered at that point cannot contain every red point of the input.

4.1.1. Lifting to three dimensions

Let disk(p, r) denote the disk of radius r centered at p. Consider the mapping of such a disk to the point

$$d = \vartheta(\operatorname{disk}(p, r)) = (2p_x, 2p_y, r^2 - p_x^2 - p_y^2).$$

This can be interpreted as a somewhat bizarre encoding of disks as points in three dimensions. We also map a point $q \in \mathbb{R}^2$ in the plane, to the plane

$$\varphi(q) = \left(z = -q_x x - q_y y + q_x^2 + q_y^2\right).$$

Note that if d is above $h = \varphi(q)$ then

$$d_z \ge -q_x d_x - q_y d_y + q_x^2 + q_y^2. \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad r^2 - p_x^2 - p_y^2 \ge -2q_x p_x - 2q_y p_y + q_x^2 + q_y^2$$
$$\Longleftrightarrow \quad r^2 \ge \left(p_x - q_x\right)^2 + \left(p_y - q_y\right)^2 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad q \in \operatorname{disk}(p, r).$$

4.1.2. The algorithm

The following algorithm is described in the plane, but also works in higher dimensions with minor modifications. The above lifting of disks to points (in three dimensions), and points to planes, has the property that a point is above a plane \iff the original disk contains the original point. In particular, if a lifted disk $d \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is strictly below a plane h, then the original disk does not contain q (i.e., the original point lifted to h).

In the lifted space, the input is a set of n planes in three dimensions. If a plane h is red, then the computed disk must contain the original point, which means that the encoded disk d must lie above h. Namely, every red point, corresponds to a commitment of the corresponding plane, to the halfspace lying (vertically) above it. Similarly, an original blue point corresponds to a commitment to the downward halfspace. We want to find a point in this space which is feasible (after all the constraints have been committed).

The ULP oracle queries. A labeling oracle query on a plane, corresponds to providing the color of the original point, which can be done using a single NN colored query. A feasibility oracle query, is a point d in three dimensions, which corresponds to a disk, which asks whether it contains all the red points, and no blue points. The later can be answered by performing a blue NN query, and a red FN query, and then making a decision according to how the points interact with the query disk.

As such, we can plug the lifted instance into the algorithm of Theorem 2.20. This algorithm also works verbatim in higher dimensions. We thus get the following.

Theorem 4.1. Let P be a set of n points in \mathbb{R}^d . Assume that there is an underlying coloring of the point set by (say) red and blue, and there is an oracle that can answer nearest-neighbor and furthest-neighbor colored queries on P. The above algorithm computes a ball that contains all of the red points, and no blue points, if such a ball exists, using $O(\log^{d-1} n)$ NN/FN oracle queries. The running time of the algorithm is $O_d(n)$.

4.2. Learning a cover by \hbar monochromatic balls using NN queries

Problem statement. The input is a set of n colored (say, by two colors) points P, and assume that the points of P can be covered by k balls, such that each ball covers only points of a single color. Here, the access to the points is via a NN oracle queries (i.e., no FN queries). The task at hand is to classify the points correctly (i.e., decide their color) using a small number of oracle queries, by an efficient algorithm.

4.2.1. The algorithm

Lemma 4.2. Let Q be a set of m points in \mathbb{R}^d , and let \mathcal{R} be the (infinite) set of all balls in \mathbb{R}^d . One can compute, in $O(m^{d+2})$ time, the family of $O(m^{d+1})$ canonical sets induced by \mathcal{R} on Q, that is $\mathcal{F}(Q) = \{ \mathfrak{C} \cap Q \mid \mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{R} \}$.

Proof: Using the lifting from Section 4.1.1, we have a set of m hyperplanes in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} dimensions. Each face of the arrangement of these hyperplanes corresponds to a canonical set. This arrangement can be computed in $O(m^{d+1})$ time. This also computes for each face (of any dimension) the canonical set that it realizes. Since each such canonical set is of size O(m), the explicit listing of these sets requires $\Theta(m^{d+2})$ time/space.

For i > 0, let P_i denote the set of unlabeled points at the beginning of the *i*th iteration and let $n_i = |P_i|$ (i.e., $P_1 = P$, and $n_1 = n$). The algorithm computes a random sample $R_i \subseteq P_i$ of size $O(\& \log \&)$, and determines the color of the points in R_i using NN queries. The algorithm then computes the set of canonical sets $\mathcal{F}_i = \mathcal{F}(R_i)$, using Lemma 4.2. For every range $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{F}_i$, such that

$$\overline{s}_{R_i}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{|\mathbf{r} \cap R_i|}{|R_i|} \ge \frac{1}{2k},$$

and such that all the points in \mathbf{r} are of the same color, the algorithm runs a subroutine, described below in Section 4.2.2, to decide if there is a monochromatic ball that contains all the points of \mathbf{r} . Formally, the subroutine decides if there is ball \mathfrak{G} , such that all the points of $P \cap \mathfrak{G}_i$ are colored by the same color, and $\mathbf{r} \subseteq \mathfrak{G}$. If no such ball is found, the algorithm repeats this iteration until success.

The algorithm sets \mathfrak{G}_i to be the ball computed, such that $|\mathfrak{G}_i \cap P_i|$ is maximized among all such balls. The algorithm then adds \mathfrak{G}_i to the computed cover, assigns all the points in $\mathfrak{G}_i \cap P_i$ their color, and sets $P_{i+1} \leftarrow P_i \setminus \mathfrak{G}_i$. The algorithm stops once all points have been assigned their correct color (i.e., $P_i = \emptyset$).

4.2.2. Searching for a monochromatic ball containing a set r

The subroutine ,given a set of points **r** that are all (say) red, searches for a ball \mathscr{C} such that the points in $P \cap \mathscr{C}$ are all red, and $\mathbf{r} \subseteq \mathscr{C}$. The subroutine is similar in spirit to the single ball case of Section 4.1, but the details are somewhat different.

Specifically, consider the set B of all blue points in P (this set is not explicitly known, as there are points that their color is yet unknown), and consider the problem of computing a ball that contains all the points of \mathbf{r} and none of the points of B. This is an implicit undecided optimization problem, which via the lifting of Section 4.1.1, reduces to implicit undecided LP. A separation oracle here, in the original settings, is a query ball q. If q contains a blue point, one can find it by performing a colored (i.e., blue) nearest-neighbor query on the set original set of points P. Similarly, one can verify that b contains all the red points of \mathbf{r} by (say) scanning. Thus, one can use the implicit undecided LP algorithm of Lemma 2.5 (see Remark 2.6).

4.2.3. Analysis

Informally, each successful iteration reveals the color of a $\Omega(1/k)$ -fraction of the unlabeled points. Specifically, at the *i*th iteration, at least one of the k balls of the optimal solution must contain at least n_i/k points of P_i , which are all of the same color (and are yet unlabeled). As such, after $O(k \log n)$ iterations, the algorithm correctly exposes the colors of the points in P.

Preliminaries. We need the following standard results and definitions [Har11].

Definition 4.3. Let $S = (X, \mathcal{R})$ be a range space, and let x be a finite (fixed) subset of X. Consider a subset $N \subseteq x$ (which might be a multi-set). For a range $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{R}$, its *measure* is denoted by $\overline{m}(\mathbf{r})$, and its *estimate* is $\overline{s}(\mathbf{r})$, where

$$\overline{m}(\mathbf{r}) = rac{|\mathbf{r} \cap \mathsf{x}|}{|\mathsf{x}|} \qquad ext{and} \qquad \overline{s}(\mathbf{r}) = rac{|\mathbf{r} \cap N|}{|N|}.$$

Definition 4.4. Let $S = (X, \mathcal{R})$ be a range space, and let x be a finite subset of X. For $0 \le \varepsilon, p \le 1$, a subset $N \subseteq x$ is a (relative) (ε, p) -approximation for x, if for any range $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{R}$, we have

$$\overline{m}(\mathbf{r}) \ge p \implies (1 - \varepsilon)\overline{m}(\mathbf{r}) \le \overline{s}(\mathbf{r}) \le (1 + \varepsilon)\overline{m}(\mathbf{r}).$$

$$\overline{m}(\mathbf{r})$$

Theorem 4.5 ([LLS01, Har11]). Let $S = (X, \mathcal{R})$ be a range space with VC dimension δ , and let \times be a finite subset of X. A sample N of size $O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 p} \left(\delta \log p^{-1} + \log \varphi^{-1}\right)\right)$ is a relative (ε, p) -approximation with probability $\geq 1 - \varphi$.

Fact 4.6. Let $X = \mathbb{R}^d$, and let \mathcal{R} be the set of balls in \mathbb{R}^d . The VC dimension of (X, \mathcal{R}) is d + 1.

Lemma 4.7. Given a set $\mathbf{r} \subseteq P$ of (say) red points, such that there exists a ball \mathfrak{G} such that all the points of $\mathfrak{G} \cap P$ are of the same color, and $\mathbf{r} \subseteq \mathfrak{G}$, the subroutine of Section 4.2.2 returns a monochromatic ball that covers the points of \mathbf{r} .

Proof: Clearly, the (implicit) undecided LP instance being created by the subroutine is feasible, and as described, the NN queries on the blue points provide a separation oracle for this instance. As such, the undecided LP would return a feasible point, which corresponds to the desired ball.

Lemma 4.8. Under the assumption that the input can be covered by & monochromatic balls, an iteration of the above algorithm succeeds with probability close to one, and computes a monochromatic ball that covers at least 2/(5&) fraction of the uncolored points.

Proof: In the beginning of the iteration there is a set $Q \subseteq P$ of n_i points that are not colored yet. As such, by assumption, there is a ball \mathscr{C}' in the optimal cover, which is monochromatic, and covers at least $\lceil n_i/\aleph \rceil$ points of Q. Since the range space of balls in \mathbb{R}^d is of VC dimension d + 1, it follows that the sample $R \subseteq Q$ is a relative (ε, p) -approximation for balls of Q, where $p = 1/4 \aleph$ and $\varepsilon = 1/4$. In particular, for this sample, with probability close to one, we have that $\overline{s}(\mathscr{C}') \ge (1-1/4)\overline{m}(\mathscr{C}') \ge (1-1/4)/\aleph$. This implies that $\overline{s}_R(\mathscr{C}') \ge 1/(2\aleph)$. As such, if the sample is successful, the algorithm would find a canonical set \mathbf{r} of the sample that contains at least $1/(2\aleph)$ fraction of the sample, and this canonical set has a monochromatic ball that contains the points of \mathbf{r} .

As such, the subroutine would return a monochromatic ball \mathcal{C} that contains **r**. But then, by the relative approximation property of the sample, we have that

$$|\mathfrak{C} \cap Q| = \overline{m}(\mathfrak{C}) |Q| \ge \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon} \overline{s}_R(\mathbf{r}) |Q| = \frac{4}{5} \cdot \frac{1}{2\mathfrak{K}} |Q| \ge \frac{2}{5\mathfrak{K}} |Q|.$$

Theorem 4.9. Let P be a set of n points in \mathbb{R}^d , such that there are (unknown) & monochromatic balls that cover all the points of P. Furthermore, assume we are given an oracle that can answer NN colored queries on P. Then, one can compute the color of all the points of P using $O(\&^{d+2}\log^{2d+3} n)$ queries (this bound holds in expectation). The expected running time of the algorithm is $O(\&^{d+2}n\log^{d+1}\&)$.

Proof: By Lemma 4.8, at each successful iteration the algorithm decreases the number of uncolored points by a factor of 1 - 2/(5k). As such, after $m = 1 + \lceil (5k/2) \ln n \rceil$ iterations, we have that

$$n_i \le n(1 - \frac{2}{5k})^m < n \exp\left(-\frac{2}{5k} \cdot \frac{5k}{2}\right)^{\ln n} = 1,$$

since $1 - x \leq \exp(-x)$.

Since the probability of a successful iteration is at least half, in expectation (and also with high probability), the overall number of iterations performed by the algorithm is $O(\hbar \log n)$.

Every iteration, the algorithm takes a sample of size $\nu = O(k \log k)$, and performs $O(k \log k)$ NN queries to color these points. The algorithm spends $O(\nu^{d+2})$ time generating all the canonical sets associated with the sample, and it potentially performs $O(\nu^{d+1})$ calls to the subroutine of Section 4.2.2. Each such call takes linear time, but uses $O(\log^{d+1} n)$ oracle NN calls. As such, the total number of NN queries performed by the algorithm is

$$O\Big(\big(\hbar\log\hbar+\nu^{d+1}\log^{d+1}n\big)\hbar\log n\Big)=O\Big(\hbar^{d+2}\log^{2d+3}n\Big).$$

The running time for the first O(k) iterations is $O((\nu^{d+2} + \nu^{d+1}n)k) = O(k^{d+2}n \log^{d+1}k)$. Since the number of unlabeled points shrinks (in expectation) by a constant factor every O(k) iterations, we get that the overall running time is proportional to the above bound.

5. Covering by triangles, and terrain simplification

5.1. Learning a cover by k monochromatic triangles

Problem statement. The input is a set P of n red and blue colored points. Furthermore, assume that the points of P can be covered by k monochromatic triangles (i.e., all points covered by a single triangle have the same color). We assume access to the following two oracles:

- (A) COLORED TRIANGLE ORACLE: Given a query triangle \triangle and a color c, if the color of all the points of $\triangle \cap P$ is c, it return so. Otherwise, the oracle returns a point in $\triangle \cap P$ with its color being different than c.
- (B) SAMPLING ORACLE: Given a partial cover $\triangle_1, \ldots, \triangle_i$, the oracle return a point randomly sampled from $P \setminus \bigcup_i \triangle_i$. If all points are covered, the oracle reports this.

The algorithm. For i > 0, let P_i denote the set of unlabeled points at the beginning of the *i*th iteration and let $n_i = |P_i|$ (i.e., $P_1 = P$, and $n_1 = n$). The algorithm computes a random sample $R_i \subseteq P_i$ of size $O(k \log k)$, and determines the color of the points in R_i using oracle queries (each query is a tiny triangle containing a single point).

Let L_i be the set of lines induced by pairs of points of R_i . Observe that $|L_i| = O(|R_i|^2) = O(k^2 \log^2 k)$. The arrangement of $\mathcal{A}(L_i)$ has $O(|L_i|^2) = O(k^4 \log^4 k)$ vertices. The algorithm then iterates over 3-tuples of vertices of $\mathcal{A}(L_i)$. There are $O(k^{12} \log^{12} k)$ triangles defined by such tuples. For each such triangle Δ , the algorithm first verifies that it is sufficiently heavy in the sample (i.e., $\overline{s}_{R_i}(\Delta) \geq 1/(10k)$), and that the points it covers in the sample are monochromatic. Then, the algorithm issues a query to the oracle to verify that all the points covered by the triangle in P are of the same color. If so, the algorithm adds Δ to the cover, and sets $P_{i+1} \leftarrow P_i \setminus \Delta$. The algorithm then continues to the next iteration.

If no good triangle is found, the algorithm retries by setting $P_{i+1} \leftarrow P_i$, and continuing to the next iteration. The algorithm stops once all points have been assigned their correct color (i.e., $P_i = \emptyset$).

5.1.1. Analysis

Consider a sequence $P = \langle p_1, \ldots, p_{dk} \rangle$ in \mathbb{R}^d . Its *average* is the point $c = \operatorname{avg}(P) = \sum_i p_i/dk$. For $i \in \llbracket k \rrbracket = \{1, \ldots, k\}$, let h_i^+ be the halfspace whose boundary passes through the points $p_{(i-1)k+1}, \ldots, p_{ik}$, and it contains c in its interior. The *polytope* induced by P is $\mathfrak{I}(P) = \bigcap_i h_i^+$.

Lemma 5.1. Let $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a set of points, and let \mathcal{K} be a closed polytope in \mathbb{R}^d formed by the intersection of k halfspaces. Furthermore, assume that P is contained in the interior of \mathcal{K} . Then, there is a sequence T of $k(d^2 - d + 1)$ points of P, such that $P \subseteq \mathfrak{I}(T) \subseteq \mathcal{K}$.

Proof: The proof is illustrated in Figure 5.1 (A)–(F). Let $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{CH}(P)$ be the convex-hull of P. Every (d-1)-dimensional face of \mathcal{C} has a hyperplane β that supports the face. The intersection of these halfspaces is \mathcal{C} . Let $\beta_1^+, \ldots, \beta_t^+$ be these (closed) halfspaces – that is $\mathcal{C} = \bigcap_i \beta_i^+$.



Figure 5.1: Given a triangle \mathcal{K} that covers a set P of m "desired" points, there is a triangle defined by nine points of P, such that this triangle covers at least m/4 of P, and is strictly contained inside the original triangle.

Let $\mathcal{K} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i^+$, where α_i^+ is a closed halfspace. Furthermore, let α_i^- be the complement (closed) halfspace to α_i^+ , for all *i*. Since $\alpha_i^- \cap \mathcal{C} = \emptyset$, it follows by Helly's Theorem that there are *d* halfspaces, say, $\beta_1^+, \ldots, \beta_d^+$ such that $\alpha_i^- \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^d \beta_i^+ = \emptyset$. Let $P \cap \beta_i$ be the set of *d* points supporting this halfspace. We have that the sequence of d^2 points $P \cap \beta_1, P \cap \beta_2, \ldots, P \cap \beta_d$ induces the cone $\bigcap_{i=1}^d \beta_i^+$. In particular, compute the inducing sequences for each face of \mathcal{K} . Concatenating these sequences, result in a sequence *T* of kd^2 points, such that the induced polytope is an intersection of cones that avoids all the faces of \mathcal{K} . That is, $P \subseteq \mathcal{I}(T) \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, as desired.

The number of points in the sequence can be further reduced, by taking $v_i \in P$ to the closest vertex of C to β_i^- . Then there are d halfspaces, whose boundary passes through v_i , such that their intersection avoids β_i^- . Since they all share the common vertex v_i , the inducing sequence in this case is of length d(d-1) + 1, or k(d(d-1) + 1) overall (the encoding of the inducing sequence is slightly different, but this is a minor issue which we ignore).

Lemma 5.2. If the input can be covered by k monochromatic triangles, then an iteration of the above algorithm succeeds with probability close to one, and computes a monochromatic triangle that covers at least 1/(10k) fraction of the unlabeled points.

Proof: In the beginning of the *i*th iteration there is a set $P_i \subseteq P$ of n_i points that are uncolored. As such, by assumption, there is a triangle Δ_i in the optimal cover which is monochromatic, and covers at least $\lceil n_i/k \rceil$ points of P_i .

Lemma 5.1 implies that there is a sequence T_i of 9 points of $R_i \cap \Delta_i$, such that the hexagon it induces, denoted by $\mathfrak{I}(T_i)$, has the property that $R_i \cap \Delta_i \subseteq \mathfrak{I}(T_i) \subseteq \Delta_i$. This hexagon can be triangulated by a bottom vertex triangulation into 4 triangles, each of which is induced by a triplet of vertices of $\mathcal{A}(L_i)$ and is thus examined by the algorithm. In particular, one of these 4 triangles must contain at least $1/4\mathfrak{K}$ -fraction of the points of P_i , and all the points of P (and thus of P_i) that this triangle covers are of the same color. See Figure 5.1.

By Theorem 4.5, we have that for a suitable choice of constants, R_i is a $(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{16k})$ -relative approximation of the range space of triangles over the set P_i . Due to that, the heaviest of the 4 triangles contains enough sample points to trigger a colored triangle oracle query by the algorithm, and will thus be added to the solution, as all the points in P it covers are of the same color. Thus, as in Lemma 4.8, the "heavy" monochromatic triangle returned by the algorithm in this iteration covers $\Omega(n_i/k)$ points of P_i .

Lemma 5.3. The above algorithm has the following performance guarantees with high probability:

- (A) It performs $O(k \log n)$ iterations.
- (B) Its overall running time is $O(k^{14}\log^{13}k\log n)$
- (C) It performs $O(k^2 \log k \log n)$ sampling oracle queries.
- (D) It performs $O(k^{13}\log^{12} k \log n)$ colored triangle oracle queries.

Proof: By Lemma 5.2 each iteration of the algorithm, with probability close to one, labels $\Omega(1/k)$ fraction of the remaining uncolored points. It follows that with high probability (and in expectation) the algorithm is done after $O(k \log n)$ iterations.

The number of triangles tested in each iteration is $\alpha_1 = O(k^{12} \log^{12} k)$. For each such triangle, verifying that it is heavy and monochromatic, for the sample, takes $\alpha_2 = O(k \log k)$ time. The algorithm issues potentially two colored triangle queries for such triangle. As the algorithm performs $\alpha_3 = O(k \log n)$ iterations, we conclude that the algorithm performs $\alpha_3\alpha_1 = O(k^{13} \log^{12} k \log n)$ colored triangle oracle queries, and $O(|R_i|\alpha_3) = O(k^2 \log k \log n)$ sampling oracle queries. The running time of the algorithm is $O(\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3) = O(k^{14} \log^{13} k \log n)$.

Theorem 5.4. (A) The input is a set $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ of n unlabeled points that can be covered by k monochromatic triangles, such that the access to P is only via a colored triangle and sampling oracles. One can compute a cover of P by $O(k \log n)$ triangles, with the following bounds (which hold with high probability):

- (I) It performs $O(k \log n)$ iterations.
- (II) Its overall running time is $O(k^{14}\log^{13} k \log n)$
- (III) It performs $O(k^2 \log k \log n)$ sampling oracle queries.
- (IV) It performs $O(k^{13}\log^{12} k \log n)$ colored triangle oracle queries.

(B) If the input is an explicitly colored set P of n points in the plane, that can be covered by k monochromatic triangles, then one can compute a cover of it by $O(k \log n)$ triangles in $O(nk^{13} \log^{13} k \log n)$ expected time.

Proof: Part (A) follows from the above. As for part (B), we implement the two oracles naïvely, by scanning the colored input and carrying out the desired task. Since each oracle query can be done in O(n) time, the above bound follows.

5.2. Terrain simplification

The problem. Given a set P of n points in \mathbb{R}^3 sampled from an unknown function f(x, y), find a piecewiselinear function g(x, y), such that for all $p = (x, y, f(x, y)) \in P$, we have $|f(x, y) - g(x, y)| \leq \tau$, for some prespecified $\tau > 0$.

In the following, we assume that there exists a piecewise linear function made out of k triangles that provides the desired approximation, that is – the point set has a (k, τ) -terrain.

Notations. For a point $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$, let p_{\downarrow} be its projection to the *xy*-plane. Similarly, for a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$, let $X_{\downarrow} = \{p_{\downarrow} \mid p \in X\}.$

Definition 5.5. Let $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ be a set of points. A triangle $\triangle' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ is τ -admissible if all the points of P that are vertically above/below it, are in vertical distance at most τ from it.

Definition 5.6. A triangle $\triangle \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ covers a set $S \subseteq P$, if

- (i) there exists a lifted three-dimensional triangle $\triangle' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$, such that $\triangle = \triangle'_1$,
- (ii) $S_{\downarrow} \subseteq \triangle$,
- (iii) and \triangle' is τ -admissible.

Definition 5.7. A set Ξ of triangles in \mathbb{R}^2 is a τ -cover of P, if every point of P is covered by some triangle of Ξ .

Given a τ -cover of P by t triangles, it can be made into a terrain by triangulating the arrangement created by the triangles, and lifting the resulting triangles back to three dimensions. The resulting terrain has $O(t^2)$ triangles.

Oracle access: In the following we assume we have two oracles available:

- (I) VALIDATE TRIANGLE: Check if a triangle is admissible. Given a triangle $\triangle \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ and τ , decide if the points of P with their projection contained in \triangle can be τ -approximated by a lifting of \triangle to \mathbb{R}^3 . This oracle can be implemented via linear programming in linear time.
- (II) SAMPLE UNCOVERED POINT. Given a collection of $(\tau \text{ valid})$ triangles $\triangle_1, \ldots, \triangle_t$, return a random point of P that is not τ -covered by these triangles.

Theorem 5.8. Let P be a set of n points in \mathbb{R}^3 that has a (k, τ) -terrain (both k and τ are provided), where the access to data is provided by the above two oracles. One can compute a τ -cover of P with $O(k \log n)$ triangles. Alternatively, one can compute a $(O(k^2 \log^2 n), \tau)$ -terrain for P. The running time of the algorithm is $O(k^{14} \log^{13} k \log n)$ (which also bounds the number of oracle queries performed).

Without oracle access, the algorithm can be implemented to run in $O(nk^{14}\log^{13}k\log n)$ time.

Proof: Surprisingly, the same algorithm as Theorem 5.4 applies readily. The check whether or not a triangle is admissible (i.e., in the previous settings, this was checking if all the points in the triangle are all red or are all blue) is now reduced to a single validate triangle oracle query.

Once the coverage by k triangles is computed, one can compute the associated terrain by triangulating the arrangement of the projected triangles, and lifting the triangles back to three dimensions.

Since the two oracles can be implemented in $O(nk \log n)$ time, as the cover has at most $O(k \log n)$ triangles, the bound on the running time follows, as each oracle call can be implemented in linear time, as described above.

Acknowledgments The authors thank Pankaj Agarwal for useful discussions. We thank Lev Reyzin for pointing out the work by Maass and Turán [MT94a, MT94b].

References

- [AD97] P. K. Agarwal and P. K. Desikan. An efficient algorithm for terraine simplification. Proc. 8th ACM-SIAM Sympos. Discrete Algs. (SODA), 139–147, 1997.
- [AES10] B. Aronov, E. Ezra, and M. Sharir. Small-size ε -nets for axis-parallel rectangles and boxes. SIAM J. Comput., 39(7): 3248–3282, 2010.
- [Ang87] D. Angluin. Queries and concept learning. Mach. Learn., 2(4): 319–342, 1987.

- [AS98] P. K. Agarwal and S. Suri. Surface approximation and geometric partitions. SIAM J. Comput., 27(4): 1016–1035, 1998.
- [Cha04] T. M. Chan. An optimal randomized algorithm for maximum Tukey depth. Proc. 15th ACM-SIAM Sympos. Discrete Algs. (SODA), 430–436, 2004.
- [Cha19] T. M. Chan. Dynamic geometric data structures via shallow cuttings. Proc. 35th Int. Annu. Sympos. Comput. Geom. (SoCG), 24:1–24:13, 2019.
- [DMW04] M. E. Dyer, N. Megiddo, and E. Welzl. Linear programming. Handbook of Discrete and Computational Geometry, Second Edition. Ed. by J. E. Goodman and J. O'Rourke. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2004, pp. 999–1014.
- [Har00] S. Har-Peled. Taking a walk in a planar arrangement. SIAM J. Comput., 30(4): 1341–1367, 2000.
- [Har11] S. Har-Peled. Geometric approximation algorithms. Vol. 173. Math. Surveys & Monographs. Boston, MA, USA: Amer. Math. Soc., 2011.
- [HJ19] S. Har-Peled and M. Jones. Journey to the center of the point set. Proc. 35th Int. Annu. Sympos. Comput. Geom. (SoCG), vol. 129. 41:1–41:14, 2019.
- [HJ20] S. Har-Peled and M. Jones. On separating points by lines. Discret. Comput. Geom., 63(3): 705–730, 2020.
- [HJR20] S. Har-Peled, M. Jones, and S. Rahul. Active learning a convex body in low dimensions. Proc. 47th Int. Colloq. Automata Lang. Prog. (ICALP), vol. 168. 64:1–64:17, 2020.
- [HKMR16] S. Har-Peled, N. Kumar, D. M. Mount, and B. Raichel. Space exploration via proximity search. Discrete Comput. Geom., 56(2): 357–376, 2016.
- [JM94] S. Jadhav and A. Mukhopadhyay. Computing a centerpoint of a finite planar set of points in linear time. Discrete Comput. Geom., 12: 291–312, 1994.
- [KLMZ17] D. M. Kane, S. Lovett, S. Moran, and J. Zhang. Active classification with comparison queries. Proc. 58th Annu. IEEE Sympos. Found. Comput. Sci. (FOCS), 355–366, 2017.
- [LLS01] Y. Li, P. M. Long, and A. Srinivasan. Improved bounds on the sample complexity of learning. J. Comput. Syst. Sci., 62(3): 516–527, 2001.
- [MT90] W. Maass and G. Turán. On the complexity of learning from counterexamples and membership queries. Proc. 31st Annu. IEEE Sympos. Found. Comput. Sci. (FOCS), 203–210, 1990.
- [MT94a] W. Maass and G. Turán. Algorithms and lower bounds for on-line learning of geometrical concepts. Machine Learning, 14(3): 251–269, 1994.
- [MT94b] W. Maass and G. Turán. How fast can a threshold gate learn? Proc. Work. Comput. Learning Theory and Nat. Learn. Systems, 381–414, 1994.
- [Set09] B. Settles. Active Learning Literature Survey. Tech. rep. #1648. Computer Science, Univ. Wisconsin, Madison, Jan. 2009.