

Nesting of Touching Polygons

Carsten R. Seemann^{a,b}, Peter F. Stadler^{c,d,e,f,g}, Marc Hellmuth^{h,*}

^aSwarm Intelligence and Complex Systems Group, Department of Computer Science, Leipzig University, Augustusplatz 10, D-04109 Leipzig, Germany

^bBioinformatics Group, Department of Computer Science and Interdisciplinary Center for Bioinformatics, Leipzig University, Härtelstraße 16-18, D-04107 Leipzig, Germany

^cBioinformatics Group, Department of Computer Science; Interdisciplinary Center for Bioinformatics; German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig; Competence Center for Scalable Data Services and Solutions Dresden-Leipzig; Leipzig Research Center for Civilization Diseases; and Centre for Biotechnology and Biomedicine, Leipzig University, Härtelstraße 16-18, D-04107 Leipzig, Germany

^dMax Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Inselstraße 22, D-04103 Leipzig, Germany

^eInstitute for Theoretical Chemistry, University of Vienna, Währingerstraße 17, A-1090 Wien, Austria

^fFacultad de Ciencias, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Sede Bogotá, Colombia

^gThe Santa Fe Institute, 1399 Hyde Park Rd., Santa Fe, NM 87501, United States

^hDepartment of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Stockholm University, SE - 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

Abstract

Polygons are cycles embedded into the plane; their vertices are associated with x - and y -coordinates and the edges are straight lines. Here, we consider a set of polygons with pairwise non-overlapping interior that may touch along their boundaries. Ideas of the *sweep line algorithm* by Bajaj and Dey for non-touching polygons are adapted to accommodate polygons that share boundary points. The algorithm established here achieves a running time of $\mathcal{O}(n + N \log N)$, where n is the total number of vertices and $N < n$ is the total number of “maximal outstretched segments” of all polygons. It is asymptotically optimal if the number of maximal outstretched segments per polygon is bounded. In particular, this is the case for convex polygons.

Keywords: Polygon, Planar Graph, Characterization, Recognition Algorithm
2000 MSC: 05C10

1. Introduction

Polygons are cycle graphs that are embedded in the plane as Jordan curves such that all edges are straight lines. Hence, the polygon is determined completely by the x - and y -coordinates of the vertices (i.e., the corners of the polygon), together with their adjacency. We are interested here in the problem of determining the nesting on a given set of polygons with non-overlapping interior that are, however, allowed to touch each other on their boundaries. An example are contour lines, which touch each other in saddle points or along edges that represent vertical cliffs. Since the polygon set is overlap-free by assumption, their relative locations are determined completely by a nesting tree, in which the descendants of polygon P are exactly the polygons located inside of P . The problem of determining the nesting tree of polygons arises naturally e.g. in layered manufacturing [4], in the analysis of contour data sets [8] or in graph theory [16]. Polygons nested within a polygon can also be viewed “holes”, an interpretation that has been studied as Disassociative Area Model (DAM) [9].

The special case of overlap-free polygons that do even not touch on their boundaries was considered already by Bajaj and Dey [2], with further improvements described by Zhu [19]. These authors established a “sweep line algorithm” that computes the nesting in $\mathcal{O}(n + N \log N)$, where n is the total number of vertices and $N < n$ is the total number of so-called “maximal outstretched segments” of all polygons. A related problem is the nesting of so-called

*corresponding author

Email addresses: carsten@bioinf.uni-leipzig.de (Carsten R. Seemann), studla@bioinf.uni-leipzig.de (Peter F. Stadler), marc.hellmuth@math.su.se (Marc Hellmuth)

“connected components” generated by a set of polygons. Here, only polygons that are outer boundaries of connected subgraphs are taken into account. For this problem, an $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ -time algorithm is described by [19, Chapt. 4], where n is the total number of vertices of all polygons which have distinct x - or y -coordinates.

In this contribution, we investigate in Section 3 “outstretched” segments of polygons, such that we can use “maximal” outstretched segments in Section 4 to determine whether a point lies inside or outside of a given polygon. Then, in Section 5, we investigate a set of overlap-free polygons and their maximal outstretched segments. The observations motivates an ordering of the maximal outstretched segments in Section 6, and characterizes how two polygons are nested. The main results of this contribution is in Section 7. Here, we show that the nesting problem for general overlap-free polygons can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(n + N \log N)$ operations, where n is the total number of vertices and N is the total number of maximal outstretched segments of all polygons. This removes the restriction to disjoint polygons in the algorithms of Bajaj and Dey [2], Zhu [19]. In particular, the running-time for a set of overlap-free polygons, where each polygon is convex, has bounded length or bounded number of maximal outstretched segments, is optimal.

Throughout this contribution we assume that the set of polygons is given explicitly, i.e., for each each polygon we are given a list of vertices and edges of a graph together with the embedding coordinates of vertex in the plane. In particular, the vertices and edges that are shared by multiple polygons also appear multiple times.

2. Preliminaries

Basics. For a set $e = \{x, y\}$ of two points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we denote by $s[e]$ the straight line segment between x and y , i.e., $s[e] := \{(1 - \lambda) \cdot x + \lambda \cdot y \mid \lambda \in [0, 1] \subseteq \mathbb{R}\}$. By definition, $x, y \in s[x, y]$. Moreover, the interior of straight line segment is denoted by $s(e) := s[e] \setminus \{x, y\}$. For simplicity, we write $s(x, y)$ and $s[x, y]$ instead of $s[\{x, y\}]$ and $s(\{x, y\})$, respectively. Two sets A and B *overlap*, whenever $A \cap B \notin \{A, B, \emptyset\}$. A collection \mathcal{S} of sets is *overlap-free* if no two elements in \mathcal{S} overlap.

Graphs. We consider (undirected) graphs $G = (V, E)$ with finite vertex set $V(G) = V$ and edge set $E(G) = E \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$, i.e., without loops and multiple edges. A tree T is an acyclic connected graph, and it is rooted if there is distinguished vertex ρ_T , called the root of T . A rooted forest is a graph whose connected components are rooted trees. Note a tree is a forest consisting of a single connected component. Given a rooted forest F , we can define a partial order \leq_F on $V(F)$ by putting $v \leq_F w$ whenever there is a connected component T of F that contains v and w and where v lies one the unique path connecting ρ_T and w . In this case, we say that v is an ancestor of w . Note that ρ_T is always \leq_F -minimal for all connected components T of F . A vertex v is a *child* of w (or, equivalently, w is a *parent* of v) in F if $\{v, w\} \in F$ and $w \leq_F v$. Two vertices are *siblings* if they have a common parent or if they are the roots of two distinct connected components of F .

Given a collection of sets \mathcal{S} , the *Hasse diagram* $\mathfrak{H} := \mathfrak{H}[\mathcal{S}]$ of \mathcal{S} (w.r.t. set inclusion) is a graph whose vertices are the elements in \mathcal{S} . Inclusion-maximal elements in \mathfrak{H} are called *roots*, and there is an edge $\{A_1, A_2\} \in E(\mathfrak{H})$ if and only if, $A_i \subsetneq A_j$ with $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$ and there is no $C \in \mathcal{S}$ with $A_i \subsetneq C \subsetneq A_j$. In this context, it is well-known that the Hasse diagram of an overlap-free set \mathcal{S} must be a rooted forest. For instance, this is a direct consequence of [17, Thm. 3.5.2].

Planarity and Polygons. In the following, $\varphi: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ denotes an injective map of the vertices of $G = (V, E)$ into the Euclidean plane. Given such a map φ , a (*straight-line*) *embedding* $\partial(G)$ of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is defined as $\partial(G) := \{\varphi(v) \mid v \in V\} \cup \{s[\varphi(u), \varphi(v)] \mid \{u, v\} \in E\}$. In simple words, an embedding $\partial(G)$ associates each vertex with a unique point in the plane and every edge by a straight-line connecting its endpoints. Given a subgraph H of G with embedding $\partial(G)$, we denote with $V(\partial(H)) := \{\varphi(v) \mid v \in V(H)\}$ the set of vertices and with $E(\partial(H)) := \{s[\varphi(v), \varphi(u)] \mid \{u, v\} \in E(H)\}$ the set of edges of $\partial(H)$. The latter, in particular, allows us to treat $\partial(H)$ as a graph theoretical object to which all the standard terminology of graphs applies. In the following, v_x and v_y (or, u_x and u_y) denote the x - and y -coordinate of the image $\varphi(v) = u \in \mathbb{R}^2$ of a vertex v . For $W \subseteq V(G)$, we defined the following real-valued intervals:

$$I[W] := [\min_{v \in W} v_x, \max_{x \in W} v_x), \quad I(W) := (\min_{v \in W} v_x, \max_{x \in W} v_x), \quad \text{and} \quad I[W] := [\min_{v \in W} v_x, \max_{x \in W} v_x].$$

In particular, since for an edge $e \in E(G)$ we have $e \subseteq V(G)$, the intervals $I(e)$, $I(e)$ and $I[e]$ are well-defined. In case $W = V(G)$, we write $I(G)$, $I(G)$ and $I[G]$ instead of $I[W]$, $I(W)$ and $I[W]$, respectively.

An edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E$ of G is *vertical* if $u_x = v_x$. If e is non-vertical, then $\min(e)$ denotes the (unique) vertex $w \in e = \{u, v\}$ with $w_x = \min\{u_x, v_x\}$, and $\max(e)$ is the (unique) vertex $w \in e = \{u, v\}$ with $w_x = \max\{u_x, v_x\}$. Note that $\min(e)_x < \max(e)_x$ for non-vertical edges and thus, $I[e]$, $I(e)$, $I[e]$ are non-empty in this case. For vertical edges, we leave $\min(e)$ and $\max(e)$ undefined, and we have $I[e] = \emptyset$. By the latter arguments, $I[e] = \emptyset$ if and only if e is a vertical edge.

An embedding $\partial(G)$ of G is *planar* if $s(\varphi(u), \varphi(v))$ for every edge $\{u, v\} \in E$ does not contain any point of the straight line $s[\varphi(u'), \varphi(v')]$ for every edge $\{u', v'\} \in E \setminus \{u, v\}$ [6]. A graph is *planar* if it admits a planar embedding. Due to Fáry's Theorem [6] definition of planarity is equivalent to the "usual" definition of planar graphs, where the planar embedding is defined in terms of so-called Jordan curves, see e.g. [5].

Remark 2.1. From here on, all embeddings of all graphs are considered to be planar.

A *polygon* P refers to the embedding of an cycle C_P of G , i.e., $P = \partial(C_P)$, where C_P is a connected subgraph of G such that all vertices have degree two in C_P . This type of polygons is usually called "simple" polygon. A *corner* of a polygon P refers to a point $p \in V(P)$. Note that corners may have the same x - or y -coordinate as other corners, e.g., we may have corners with coordinates (v_x, v_y) , (v'_x, v_y) and (v''_x, v_y) . Thus, corners may lie on the same straight line. We refer to the bounded region enclosed by a polygon P as its *interior* $\text{Int}(P)$ and assume that $P \cap \text{Int}(P) = \emptyset$. The *exterior* of P is the unbounded region $\text{Ext}(P) := \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus (P \cup \text{Int}(P))$.

Sets of Polygons and Nesting Forest. In the following, \mathcal{P} denotes a set of polygons and put $\text{Int}(\mathcal{P}) := \{\text{Int}(P) \mid P \in \mathcal{P}\}$. We say that \mathcal{P} is *overlap-free* if $\text{Int}(\mathcal{P})$ is overlap-free. The Hasse diagram $\mathfrak{H}[\text{Int}(\mathcal{P})]$ of $\text{Int}(\mathcal{P})$ with respect to inclusion thus is a rooted forest $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P})$, which we call the *nesting forest* of \mathcal{P} . For simplicity, we identify vertices $\text{Int}(P)$ in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P})$ by the corresponding polygons $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and thus, by slight abuse of notation, assume that $V(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P})) = \mathcal{P}$. Moreover, we say that a polygon P is *inside* of a polygon P' if $\text{Int}(P) \subseteq \text{Int}(P')$, and the two polygons *touch* if $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') = \emptyset$ but $P \cap P' \neq \emptyset$.

3. Outstretched Segments and Polygons

Given a subgraph H of G with embedding $\partial(G)$, a *segment* S (of $\partial(H)$) refers to the embedding of some subpath Q_S of H , i.e., $S = \partial(Q_S)$. We say that a vertex $v \in V(S)$ is *terminal* (in S) if v has degree one in S . Analogously, an edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E(S)$ is *terminal* (in S) if one of its vertices u or v is terminal in S . For a segment S , we define $\text{MIN}(S)$ (resp., $\text{MAX}(S)$) as the set of vertices v for which v_x is minimal (resp., maximal) among all vertices in S . If $|\text{MIN}(S)| = 1$ or $|\text{MAX}(S)| = 1$, then we write $\min(S)$ or $\max(S)$ for the unique minimal or maximal element. Note that $\min_{v \in S} v_x = v'_x$ for all $v' \in \text{MIN}(S)$ and $\max_{v \in S} v_x = v'_x$ for all $v' \in \text{MAX}(S)$.

Definition 3.1. A segment S satisfies Property (O) if for all distinct edges $e, f \in E(S)$ it holds that $I[e] \cap I[f] = \emptyset$.

Note, for all edges $e \in E(S)$, we have $I[e] \subseteq I[S]$. Moreover, $I[S] = \emptyset$ implies that $I[e] = \emptyset$ for all $e \in E(S)$. Since $I[e] = \emptyset$ precisely if e is vertical, the intervals $I[e]$ of non-vertical edges e of S partition the interval $I[S]$ whenever S satisfies (O).

Lemma 3.2. For a segment S , the following three conditions are equivalent:

- (O) S satisfies Property (O).
- (O') (a) $\min_{v \in S} v_x$ and $\max_{v \in S} v_x$ correspond to the x -coordinates of the terminal vertices of S , and
(b) $u_x \leq v_x$ for all vertices $u, v \in V(S)$ with $u \leq_S v$, where \leq_S is defined on $V(S)$ by choosing a vertex $v \in \text{MIN}(S)$ as the root of S .
- (O'') For all $\xi \in I[S]$, there is exactly one edge $e \in E(S)$ with $\xi \in I[e]$.

Proof. First, assume that the segment S consists of a single vertex or of vertical edges only and thus $\text{MIN}(S) = \text{MAX}(S)$, i.e., $\min_{v \in S} v_x = \max_{v \in S} v_x$. Thus, $I[e] = \emptyset$ for all $e \in E(S)$, and there is no $\xi \in I[S]$. Now, it is easy to see that (O), (O') and (O'') are always satisfied and, in particular, trivially equivalent. Thus, assume that S contains at least one non-vertical edge. In this case, $\min_{v \in S} v_x \neq \max_{v \in S} v_x$ and thus, there is a $\xi \in I[S]$. One easily verifies that (O) and (O'') are equivalent.

Next, suppose that S satisfies (O'). Assume, for contradiction, that (O'') is violated. Since S is connected, for all $\xi \in I(S) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ there is at least one edge e with $\xi \in I(e) \subseteq I(S)$. Since (O'') is violated, there are two edges $e = \{u, v\}, f = \{a, b\} \in E(S)$ with $\xi \in I(e) \cap I(f)$. Now, assume w.l.o.g. that $u <_S v \leq_S a <_S b$. By (O'.b) and the fact that e and f are non-vertical, $u_x < v_x \leq a_x < b_x$ and thus, $\xi < v_x \leq a_x \leq \xi$; a contradiction. Hence, if S satisfies (O'), then S satisfies (O'') as well.

Now, suppose that S satisfies (O''). As argued above, we can assume that S contains at least one non-vertical edge and thus, $\min_{v \in S} v_x \neq \max_{v \in S} v_x$. We continue with showing that (O') is satisfied by induction on the number of edges of S . Let t and t' be the terminal vertices of S . As base case, assume that S contains only one edge $e = \{t, t'\}$. Since e must be non-vertical, we have $\{\min_{v \in S} v_x, \max_{v \in S} v_x\} = \{t_x, t'_x\}$, and it is easy to see that (O') holds. Assume that (O') is satisfied for all segments S of P having m edges. Let S be a segment of P that consists of $m+1$ edges. Now, remove the terminal edge $e = \{u, t\}$ and vertex t from S to obtain the segment S_1 of P with m edges and with terminal vertices t' and u . Similarly, remove the terminal edge $\{u', t'\}$ and vertex t' from S to obtain the segment S_2 of P with m edges and terminal vertices t and u' . By assumption, both S_1 and S_2 satisfy (O'). We can assume w.l.o.g. that $t' \in \text{MIN}(S_1)$. In this case, \leq_{S_1} can be defined on $V(S_1)$ by choosing t' as the root of S_1 . Hence, the other terminal vertex u of S_1 is a \leq_{S_1} -maximal element and thus, by (O'.b), must satisfy $u \in \text{MAX}(S_1)$. In addition, we have $t'_x \leq u'_x \leq u_x$, since $t' \leq_{S_1} u' \leq_{S_1} u$.

Then, assume for contradiction that $u' \notin \text{MIN}(S_2)$ and, therefore, $\min_{v \in S_2} v_x \neq u'_x$. Since S_1 satisfies (O'.b) and since $\{t, u\}$ is a terminal edge of S , we have $\min_{v \in S_1} v_x = t'_x \leq u'_x \leq v_x$ for all vertices $v \in V(S_2) \setminus \{t\} \subseteq V(S_1)$. This and $\min_{u \in S_2} u_x \neq u'_x$ implies that $t_x < u'_x$ and, in particular, $\min_{v \in S_2} v_x = t_x$. If all edges of S_1 are vertical, it is easy to see that S satisfies (O'). Assume that S_1 contains a non-vertical edge. In this case, there is an edge $f = \{a, b\}$ in S_1 such that $a \leq_{S_1} b$ and $t'_x \leq a_x < b_x \leq u_x$. Moreover, $t_x < u'_x \leq u_x$ implies that there is a $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ for which $\min_{v \in f} v_x = a_x \leq \xi < b_x = \max_{v \in f} v_x$ and $\min_{v \in e} v_x = t_x \leq a_x \leq \xi < b_x \leq u_x = \max_{v \in e} v_x$; a contradiction since S satisfies (O''). Hence, $u' \in \text{MIN}(S_2)$. In this case, $\min_{v \in S_1} v_x = t'_x \leq u'_x = \min_{u \in S_2} u_x$ implies that $t'_x \leq v_x$ for all $v \in V(S)$ and thus, $\min_{v \in S} v_x = t'_x$ corresponds to the x -coordinates of one of its terminal vertices. Moreover, since both S_1 and S_2 satisfy (O'.b) and $t'_x = \min_{v \in S} v_x$, one easily verifies that (O'.b) must hold for S . This immediately implies that $\max_{v \in S} v_x = t_x$ corresponds to the x -coordinate of the other terminal vertex. Note, however, that $t'_x = t_x$ could be possible. In either case, S satisfies (O'.a). Hence, if S satisfies (O), then S satisfies (O') as well. In summary, therefore, Conditions (O), (O') and (O'') are equivalent. ■

It is easy to see that Property (O) is hereditary, that is:

Observation 3.3. If S is a segment that satisfies (O), then every segment $S' \subseteq S$ satisfies (O).

Definition 3.4. A segment S is *outstretched* if it satisfies (O) and its terminal edges are non-vertical. Moreover, an outstretched segment S of a polygon P is *maximally outstretched* (w.r.t. P) if there is no outstretched segment S' in P with $S \subsetneq S'$.

Note that outstretched segments S may have empty edge set in which case S can contain only a single vertex $t = \max(S) = \min(S)$. Moreover, although terminal edges of S cannot be vertical, S can contain vertical edges in its interior. In this case, it is even possible that S contains incident, i.e., consecutive, vertical edges.

Lemma 3.5. For an outstretched segment S with $E(S) \neq \emptyset$ it always holds that $\text{MIN}(S) \cap \text{MAX}(S) = \emptyset$. In particular, $\text{MIN}(S) = \{t\}$ and $\text{MAX}(S) = \{t'\}$ are singletons consisting of the terminal vertices t and t' of S only, i.e., $\min(S) = t$ and $\max(S) = t'$ are well-defined and distinct.

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, $\min_{v \in S} v_x$ and $\max_{v \in S} v_x$ correspond to the x -coordinates of terminal vertices of S . Let t and t' be the terminal vertices and $e = \{u, t\}$ and $f = \{u', t'\}$ be the terminal edges of S . Note, $e = f$ is possible. Assume w.l.o.g. that $t \in \text{MIN}(S)$. Since terminal edges of S are non-vertical, we have $\max_{v \in e} v_x \neq \min_{v \in e} v_x$ which implies that $\text{MIN}(S) \neq \text{MAX}(S)$ and, in particular, $t' \in \text{MAX}(S)$. Moreover, by (O'.b) and because e and f are non-vertical, it holds that $t_x < u_x \leq v_x \leq u'_x < t'_x$ for all vertices $v \in V(S)$ with $u \leq_S v \leq_S u'$, where \leq_S is defined on $V(S)$ by choosing t as the root. Thus, $\text{MIN}(S) = \{t\}$ and $\text{MAX}(S) = \{t'\}$, i.e., $\min(S) = t$ and $\max(S) = t'$. Moreover, $\text{MIN}(S) \cap \text{MAX}(S) = \emptyset$. ■

For later reference, we provide here the following simple result:

Lemma 3.6. *Let S, S' be two outstretched segments of a polygon P such that $E(S) \cap E(S') \neq \emptyset$. Then, $S^* = S \cup S'$ is an outstretched segment of P .*

Proof. Since S and S' are paths in P , $S^* = S \cup S'$ is a connected subgraph of P and thus, either $S^* \subsetneq P$ is a path or $S^* = P$ is a polygon, i.e., a “graph-theoretical” cycle. In either case, every vertex of S^* must have degree at most two in S^* and $E(S) \cap E(S')$ must contain at least one of the terminal edges of S as well as of S' . By Lemma 3.5, the terminal vertices $t := \min(S)$ and $\max(S)$ of S as well as $t' := \min(S')$ and $\max(S')$ are uniquely defined and distinct.

Assume, for contradiction, that $S^* = P$. In this case, it holds for the terminal vertices that $t, t', \max(S), \max(S') \in V(S) \cap V(S')$ since S and S' are paths of a cycle P whose union coincides with P . But then $t_x = t'_x$ and $\max(S)_x = \max(S')_x$ and thus, $t = t'$ and $\max(S) = \max(S')$. This and $\text{MIN}(P) \subseteq \text{MIN}(S) \cup \text{MIN}(S')$ implies that $\min(P) = t$. Since S and S' are outstretched segments and $t = t'$ refers to the unique vertex with minimum x -coordinate in S and S' , for the terminal edge $e = \{t, u\}$ of S and $f = \{t, u'\}$ of S' it must hold $u \neq u'$; otherwise t would have degree one in $S^* = P$; a contradiction to P being a cycle). But then $E(S) \cap E(S')$ does not contain the terminal edges e and f . By similar arguments, $E(S) \cap E(S')$ does not contain the terminal edges $\{\max(S), w\}$ and $\{\max(S'), w'\}$. Hence, $E(S) \cap E(S')$ does not contain any of the terminal edges of S and S' ; a contradiction.

Therefore, S^* is a path. If $S' \subseteq S$ or $S \subseteq S'$, then $S^* = S$ or $S^* = S'$, and thus S^* is an outstretched segment of P . Otherwise $S' \cap S$ is a path that contain exactly one terminal vertex S and S' and $E(S \cap S') \neq \emptyset$ contain at least one terminal, and therefore non-vertical edge. We use the partial orders \leq_S and $\leq_{S'}$ as defined Lemma 3.2 by using t and t' as the root of S and S' , respectively.

Assume, for contradiction, that S^* does not satisfy (O). Hence, there are two distinct edges f and g in S^* and a $\xi \in I[S^*]$ with $\xi \in I[f] \cap I[g]$. Since S and S' satisfy (O), we can w.l.o.g. assume that $f \in E(S) \setminus E(S')$ and $g \in E(S') \setminus E(S)$. Note, both edges f and g are non-vertical since neither $I[f] = \emptyset$ nor $I[g] = \emptyset$. Since $e, f \in E(S)$, we have $e \leq_S f$ or $f \leq_S e$, and we can assume w.l.o.g. that $e \leq_S f$. Moreover, since $e, g \in E(S')$, we have either $e \leq_{S'} g$ or $g \leq_{S'} e$. However, $g \leq_{S'} e$ together with $e \leq_S f$, implies $\xi < \max(g)_x \leq \max(e)_x \leq \min(f)_x \leq \xi$; a contradiction. Hence, $e \leq_{S'} g$ must hold. Since S and S' are paths and $f \in E(S) \setminus E(S')$ and $g \in E(S') \setminus E(S)$, there is a unique vertex $w \in V(S) \cap V(S') \subseteq V(S^*)$ that satisfies the following property: w is adjacent to $v \in V(S) \setminus V(S')$ and satisfies $w \leq_S \max(f)$ and w is adjacent to $v' \in V(S') \setminus V(S)$ and satisfies $w \leq_{S'} \max(g)$. Since $S \cap S'$ is a path with $e \in E(S \cap S')$ and $w \in V(S \cap S')$, there is a vertex $v'' \in V(S \cap S')$ adjacent to w . The latter two observations together imply $\deg_{S^*}(w) \geq 3$; a contradiction.

Hence, S^* satisfies (O). Since, in addition, the terminal edges of S^* are terminal edges of S or S' and are, thus, non-vertical, it follows that S^* is an outstretched segment. \blacksquare

Note that a similar result as in Lemma 3.6 does not hold if we only claim $V(S) \cap V(S') \neq \emptyset$ instead of $E(S) \cap E(S') \neq \emptyset$. To see this, consider the two maximal outstretched segments S_1 and S_2 in the polygon P as shown in Figure 1(right). Here S_1 and S_2 intersect in a single vertex but not in their edges. It is easy to verify that $S_1 \cup S_2$ is not an outstretched segment since Property (O) is violated.

Definition 3.7. An outstretched segment S of P is maximal if there is no outstretched segment S' of P with $S \subsetneq S'$.

The following properties of maximal outstretched segments will be useful:

Proposition 3.8. *For two distinct maximal outstretched segments S and S' of a polygon P the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. $E(S) \cap E(S') = \emptyset$, i.e. they are edge-disjoint;
2. $S \cap S' = \{\min(S), \max(S)\} \cap \{\min(S'), \max(S')\}$ i.e. they can intersect at most in their terminal vertices;
3. If $S \cap S' \neq \emptyset$, then $\min(S) = \min(S')$ or $\max(S) = \max(S')$.
4. If $|V(S) \cap V(S')| = 2$ then $S \cup S' = P$.

Proof. Let S, S' be two distinct maximal outstretched segments of a polygon P .

1. If there is an edge $e \in E(S) \cap E(S')$, then Lemma 3.6 implies that $S^* := S \cup S'$ is an outstretched segment of P and $S, S' \subseteq S^*$. Maximality implies $S = S' = S^*$; a contradiction.

2. Let $p \in S \cap S'$. By Statement (1), $E(S) \cap E(S') = \emptyset$. Since $S, S' \subseteq P$ and P is planar we can conclude that S and S' can only intersect in a common vertex, i.e., $p \in S \cap S' \subseteq V(S) \cap V(S')$. Now, assume for contradiction that $p \in V(S) \setminus \{\min(S), \max(S)\}$ or $p \in V(S') \setminus \{\min(S'), \max(S')\}$. Then, we may assume w.l.o.g. $p \in V(S) \setminus \{\min(S), \max(S)\}$.




Figure 1: Decompositions of polygons into segments. In all examples, S_i is maximal outstretched and S_i and S_{i+1} are consecutive. According to Proposition 3.8, all maximal outstretched segments S_i and S_j are edge-disjoint and intersect at most in their terminal vertices. If they intersect, $\min(S_j) = \min(S_i)$ or $\max(S_j) = \max(S_i)$ must hold, and S_i and S_j are consecutive. Otherwise, two consecutive maximal outstretched segments S_i and S_j are separated by a single vertical segment and $\min(S_j)_x = \min(S_i)_x$ or $\max(S_j)_x = \max(S_i)_x$ must hold.

Left: The vertical segment S' is not contained in a maximal outstretched segment. The maximal outstretched segments S_2 and S_3 are consecutive with distinct terminal vertices. However, $\min(S_2)_x = \min(S_3)_x$ and the terminal vertices $\min(S_2)$ and $\min(S_3)$ are connected by a path consisting of vertical edges, namely the vertical segment S' . All other consecutive maximal outstretched segments intersect in precisely one vertex.

Middle and Right: In the middle example the two consecutive segments S_1 and S_2 are vertex-disjoint. In contrast, the example on the right shows two consecutive outstretched segments S_1 and S_2 with $|V(S_1) \cap V(S_2)| = 2$ and thus, according to Proposition 3.8, $S_1 \cup S_2 = P$.

Since $S, S' \subseteq P$ and P is a graph-theoretical cycle, and since $p \in V(S) \setminus \{\min(S), \max(S)\}$, where $\min(S)$ and $\max(S)$ are terminal vertices of S , we conclude that $\deg_S(p) = 2 = \deg_P(p)$. This, together with $\deg_{S'}(p) \geq 1$, implies that there is an incident edge $\{p, p'\} \in E(S') \subseteq E(P)$ for which we have $\{p, p'\} \in E(S)$. In particular, $\{p, p'\} \in E(S) \cap E(S') \neq \emptyset$, contradicting Statement 1.

3. Assume that $S \cap S' \neq \emptyset$. By Statement 2, $S \cap S' = \{\min(S), \max(S)\} \cap \{\min(S'), \max(S')\}$. Moreover, $S, S' \subsetneq S \cup S'$. However, $S \cup S'$ cannot be a maximal outstretched segment since, otherwise, we would contradict maximality of S and S' . Hence, only $S \cup S' = P$ is possible. Since S and S' are edge-disjoint, they must therefore intersect in precisely two vertices, i.e., $\{\min(S), \max(S)\} = \{\min(S'), \max(S')\}$. This, together with $S \cup S' = P$, implies that $\min(S) = \min(S')$ or $\max(S) = \max(S')$ must hold.

4. If $|V(S) \cap V(S')| = 2$, then Statement 3 implies that $\min(S) = \min(S')$ and $\max(S) = \max(S')$. Since by Statement 1., S and S' are edge disjoint and thus internally vertex disjoint in P , we conclude that $S \cup S'$ is a graph theoretic cycle, and thus coincides with P . ■

Corollary 3.9. *Let P be a polygon. Then, for every non-vertical edge $e \in E(P)$, there is a unique maximal outstretched segment S of P such that $e \in E(S)$.*

Proof. Let $e \in E(P)$ be a non-vertical edge. Since $s[e] \subset P$ is an outstretched segment of P , there is a maximal outstretched segment S containing e . Since maximal outstretched segments are edge-disjoint by Proposition 3.8 (1), S is uniquely determined. ■

Definition 3.10. A path (segment) in P that consists of vertical edges only is called *vertical path (segment)*. Two maximal outstretched segments S and S' are *consecutive (along P)* if they are distinct and (i) $V(S) \cap V(S') \neq \emptyset$ or (ii) there is a vertical path W that does not share edges with S and S' and such that $S \cup S' \cup W$ is a segment of P .

Proposition 3.8 implies $|V(S) \cap V(S')| \leq 2$ for two distinct maximal outstretched segments S and S' . Moreover, if $|V(S) \cap V(S')| = 1$ then, by Proposition 3.8(3), two maximal outstretched segments S and S' intersect precisely in one of their terminal vertices. In this case, it is easy to verify that $S \cup S'$ forms a segment of P . Together with Proposition 3.8(4), this implies

Observation 3.11. For two consecutive maximal outstretched segments S and S' of P with $V(S) \cap V(S') \neq \emptyset$ it holds that $S \cup S' = P$ or $S \cup S'$ is a segment in P .

Lemma 3.12. *If S and S' are consecutive maximal outstretched segments along P , then $\min(S)_x = \min(S')_x$ or $\max(S)_x = \max(S')_x$.*

Proof. In Case (i) of Def. 3.10, the statement of the lemma follows by Proposition 3.8 (3). Now, consider Case (ii) of Def. 3.10: Since W is vertical and S and S' are consecutive, (at least) one of the following equations must hold: $\min(S)_x = \min(S')_x$, $\max(S)_x = \max(S')_x$, $\min(S)_x = \max(S')_x$, or $\max(S)_x = \min(S')_x$. In the latter two cases, $S \cup S' \cup W$ is an outstretched segment of P , contradicting maximality of S and S' ; the remaining two equalities constitute the statement of Lemma. ■

In the following observation we collect basic properties of terminal vertices of consecutive maximal outstretched segments on a simple polygon. They are immediate consequences of the definition, Lemma 3.12 and the fact that maximal outstretched segments are edge-disjoint graph-theoretic paths on a given simple polygon.

Observation 3.13. Let P be a polygon and S, S' distinct maximal outstretched segments of P with sets of terminal vertices $\{t_1, t_2\} \in S$ and $\{t'_1, t'_2\} \in S'$. Then, by Def. 3.10, if $\{t_1, t_2\} \cap \{t'_1, t'_2\} \neq \emptyset$, then S and S' are consecutive along P . A terminal vertex t of S is a terminal vertex of at most one other maximal outstretched segment (otherwise, t would have degree 3 in P which is not possible). Moreover, if t is a terminal vertex that appears as a terminal vertex in only one maximal outstretched segment S , then there is a uniquely defined maximal outstretched segment S'' such that S and S'' are consecutive and S'' has a terminal vertex t'' with $t_x = t''_x$. In this case, t and t'' are the terminal vertices of a vertical segment W since, by definition, all non-vertical edges are contained in maximal outstretched segments. Moreover, t'' does not appear as a terminal vertex in any other maximal outstretched segment (otherwise, t'' would be contained in W , S'' and some other maximal outstretched segment and thus, would have degree 3 in P).

4. Sweep-Lines and the Parity of Maximal Outstretched Segments

Bajaj and Dey [2] devised a nesting-algorithm based on the “sweep-line” approach for overlap-free sets of polygons with the additional condition that polygons do not touch each other. Here, we will generalize this approach to situations where polygons may touch. Our starting point is the “ray-casting algorithm” devised by Shimrat [18] in 1962 (also known as “crossing number algorithm” or “even-odd rule algorithm”). It solves the *point-in-polygon problem* of determining whether a given point in the plane lies inside, outside, or on the boundary of a polygon, see [7] for a survey of the topic.

In the following, let S be an outstretched segment of polygon P . By Def. 3.1 and Lemma 3.2, for every $x \in I[S]$ there is a unique non-vertical edge e in S such that $x \in I[e]$. In other words, the intervals $I[e]$ of the non-vertical edges $e \in E(S)$ partition $I[S]$. In upcoming proofs, we need also the identification of edges with $x \in I[S] = [\min(S)_x, \max(S)_x]$ instead of $I[S]$. Let f denote the edge in S for which $\max(f)_x = \max(S)_x$. Since S is outstretched, f corresponds to one of the two terminal edges of S and is, in particular, uniquely determined. Repeating the latter arguments, for every $x \in I[S]$ there is a unique non-vertical edge e in S such that $x \in I[e]$ whenever $x \neq \max(S)_x$ and, in case $x = \max(S)_x$, there is the unique edge f with $x \in I[f] \cup \{\max(S)_x\}$. In this way, we obtain a unique identification of elements $x \in I[S]$ and edges e in S . In this case, we say that *the edge e is associated with x* . Thus, for all $x \in I[S]$, we can define $y(S, x)$ as the unique y -coordinate y^* such that $(x, y^*) \in s[u, v]$ for the unique edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E(S)$ that is associated with x . Note that there might be additional, vertical edges $e' = \{u', v'\} \in E(S)$ such that $(x, y) \in s[u', v']$. For these vertical edges, however, $I[e'] = \emptyset$, and $x \neq t_x$ for a terminal vertex t of a non-vertical edge in S .

A direct consequence of the ray-casting algorithm, restated in our notation, is the following observation:

Proposition 4.1 (Bajaj and Dey [2, L. 2.4]). *Let P be a polygon and $p = (\xi, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus P$. Then, $p \in \text{Int}(P)$ if and only if the number of edges $e \in E(P)$ with $\xi \in I[e]$ and $y < y(s[e], \xi)$ is odd.*

Proposition 4.1 and Corollary 3.9 imply

Lemma 4.2. *Let P be a polygon and $p = (\xi, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus P$. Then, $p \in \text{Int}(P)$ if and only if the number of maximal outstretched segments with $\xi \in I[S]$ and $y < y(S, \xi)$ is odd.*

Proof. The *only-if* direction is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.1 and Corollary 3.9 together with the fact that $e \in E(S)$ with $\xi \in I[e] \subseteq I[S]$ implies $y < y(s[e], \xi) = y(S, \xi)$. For the *if* direction suppose that the number of maximal outstretched segments S with $\xi \in I[S]$ and $y < y(S, \xi)$ is odd. Since $\xi \in I[S]$ there must be at least one edge $e \in E(S)$ with $x \in I[e]$ and $y < y(s[e], \xi)$. By Property (O), for all distinct edges $f, f' \in E(S)$ it must hold that $I[f] \cap I[f'] = \emptyset$.

Hence, the edge e in S with $x \in I[e]$ and $y < y(s[e], \xi)$ is unique. Thus, the number of such edges must be odd and Prop. 4.1 implies that $p \in \text{Int}(P)$. \blacksquare

The aim of this section is to show that instead of considering whether the number of maximal outstretched segments with $\xi \in I[S]$ and $y < y(S, \xi)$ is odd or even for a given ξ , one can assign the property of being ‘‘odd’’ or ‘‘even’’ to the maximal outstretched segments S of P themselves, independent of the choice of ξ . We start with the following technical detail:

Lemma 4.3. *Two maximal outstretched segments S, S' of a polygon P satisfy*

1. $y(S, \xi) \leq y(S', \xi)$ for all $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$; or
2. $y(S, \xi) \geq y(S', \xi)$ for all $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$.

Proof. Assume, for contradiction, that there are two distinct maximal outstretched segments S, S' of a polygon P and two $\xi, \xi' \in I[S] \cap I[S']$ such that $y(S, \xi) > y(S', \xi)$ and $y(S, \xi') < y(S', \xi')$. We assume w.l.o.g. that $\xi < \xi'$. Note that $f: I[S] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via $x \mapsto y(S, x)$ as well as $g: I[S'] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ via $x \mapsto y(S', x)$ are continuous function and we can, therefore, apply the intermediate-value-theorem to conclude that there is a $\xi'' \in (\xi, \xi')$, and thus $\xi'' \notin \{\min(S)_x, \max(S)_x\}$, such that $f(\xi'') = g(\xi'')$. But then, we have $p := (\xi'', f(\xi'')) \in S \cap S'$ with $p \notin \{\min(S), \max(S)\}$, which is a contradiction to Prop. 3.8 (2). \blacksquare

Let \mathcal{S} be the set of all maximal outstretched segments of the polygon P . In the following, we will need to argue about the number of maximal outstretched segments that are located above a given $S \in \mathcal{S}$ (including S itself).

Definition 4.4. Let \mathcal{S} be the set of all maximal outstretched segments of the polygon P , $S \in \mathcal{S}$, and $\xi \in I(S)$. Then, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_{\xi, S} &:= \{S' \in \mathcal{S} \mid \xi \in I(S') \text{ and } y(S', \xi) \geq y(S, \xi)\}, \\ \mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}^{\min} &:= \{S' \in \mathcal{S} \mid \min(S')_x = \xi \text{ and } \min(S')_y \geq y(S, \xi)\}, \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}^{\max} &:= \{S' \in \mathcal{S} \mid \max(S')_x = \xi \text{ and } \max(S')_y \geq y(S, \xi)\}. \end{aligned}$$

By definition, we have $\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}^{\min} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}$ while $\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}^{\max} \not\subseteq \mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}$ is possible. We have excluded $\xi = \min(S)_x$ and $\xi = \max(S)_x$ since the outstretched segments preceding and succeeding S along P , respectively, would always be included irrespective of whether they are all above or below S for other values of ξ .

Lemma 4.5. *Let S a maximal outstretched segment of a polygon P and $\xi \in I(S)$. Then, both $|\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}^{\min}|$ and $|\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}^{\max}|$ are even.*

Proof. Let P be a polygon, S a maximal outstretched segment of P , let $\xi \in I(S)$, and set $N^{\min} := |\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}^{\min}|$ and $N^{\max} := |\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}^{\max}|$, respectively. We determine N^{\min} and N^{\max} by traversing terminal vertices t of maximal outstretched segments in the polygon P in clockwise order starting from $\min(S)$. Since $\xi = \min(S)_x$ is excluded by assumption, we still have $N^{\min} = N^{\max} = 0$ after departing from $\min(S)$. Note that N^{\min} and N^{\max} remain unchanged whenever $t_y < y(S, \xi)$ or $t_x \neq \xi$. Hence, suppose in the following that t is a terminal vertex of S and satisfies $t_x = \xi$ and $t_y \geq y(S, \xi)$. If t is shared by two consecutive maximal outstretched segments S and S' , then by Lemma 3.12 either $t_x = \min(S)_x = \min(S')_x$ or $t_x = \max(S)_x = \max(S')_x$, and thus either N^{\max} or N^{\min} is increased by 2. Assume now that t is a terminal vertex that is not shared by consecutive segments. Let t' be the first terminal vertex of the maximal outstretched segment S' that is encountered after t when traversing the terminal vertices in clockwise order. Then t and t' are connected by a path W consisting of vertical edges only, since every non-vertical edge is contained in a maximal outstretched segment. According to Obs. 3.13, S and S' are consecutive, and t' satisfies $t'_x = t_x = \xi$. Since the polygon P is simple by assumption, no other terminal vertex lies on the vertical segment W . Furthermore, if $t_y > y(S, \xi)$ then $t'_y > y(S, \xi)$, since otherwise W and S would intersect or touch, contradicting that P is simple. Again, by Lemma 3.12, either both t and t' are the minima or both are the maxima of their respective segments. The consecutive pair $\{t, t'\}$ therefore also adds 2 to either N^{\max} and N^{\min} . Thus, both N^{\max} and N^{\min} are even when the traversal of P returns to $\min(S)$. \blacksquare

Lemma 4.6. *Let S be a maximal outstretched segment of a polygon P and $v \in V(P)$. Suppose that there are $\xi, \xi' \in I(S)$ such that $x := v_x \in (\xi, \xi')$ but $w_x \notin (\xi, \xi')$ for all $w \in V(P)$ with $w_x \neq v_x$. Then, $|\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}| - |\mathcal{N}_{x, S}^{\max}| = |\mathcal{N}_{\xi', S}| - |\mathcal{N}_{x, S}^{\min}|$.*

Proof. Let S be a maximal outstretched segment of a polygon P and $v \in V(P)$. Moreover, suppose that there are $\xi, \xi' \in I(S)$ such that $x := v_x \in (\xi, \xi']$ but $w_x \notin (\xi, \xi']$ for all $w \in V(P)$ with $w_x \neq v_x$. In particular, the latter implies that there is no $w \in V(P)$ with $w_x \in (\xi, \xi'] \setminus \{x\}$. By assumption, $x, \xi, \xi' \in I(S)$. Since S is fixed, we simplify the notation, and write $\mathcal{N}_\xi := \mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}$, $\mathcal{N}_{\xi'} := \mathcal{N}_{\xi', S}$, $\mathcal{N}_x^{\max} := \mathcal{N}_{x, S}^{\max}$ and $\mathcal{N}_x^{\min} := \mathcal{N}_{x, S}^{\min}$. First, we prove *Claim 1*: (a) $\mathcal{N}_\xi \setminus \mathcal{N}_x^{\max} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{\xi'} \setminus \mathcal{N}_x^{\min}$, (b) $\mathcal{N}_{\xi'} \setminus \mathcal{N}_x^{\min} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_\xi \setminus \mathcal{N}_x^{\max}$ and (c) $|\mathcal{N}_\xi \setminus \mathcal{N}_x^{\max}| = |\mathcal{N}_{\xi'} \setminus \mathcal{N}_x^{\min}|$.

First, consider *Claim (1a)*, and let $S' \in \mathcal{N}_\xi \setminus \mathcal{N}_x^{\max}$. Hence, $\min(S')_x \leq \xi < \max(S')_x$ and $y(S', \xi) \geq y(S, \xi)$. Thus, if $\max(S')_x = x$, then Lemma 4.3 implies $y(S', x) \geq y(S, x)$, and thus, $S' \in \mathcal{N}_x^{\max}$; a contradiction. Hence, $\min(S')_x \leq \xi < \max(S')_x \neq x$. This, together with $\max(S') \in V(P)$ and the fact that there is no $w \in V(P)$ with $w_x \in (\xi, \xi'] \setminus \{x\}$, implies $\min(S') \leq \xi < \xi' < \max(S')_x$, and thus, $\xi' \in I(S') \cap I(S)$. Hence, $y(S', \xi) \geq y(S, \xi)$, together with Lemma 4.3, implies $y(S', \xi') \geq y(S, \xi')$, and thus, $S' \in \mathcal{N}_{\xi'}$. Moreover, $\min(S')_x \leq \xi < x$ implies $\min(S')_x \neq x$. Consequently, $S' \notin \mathcal{N}_x^{\min}$. The latter two observations together imply *Claim (1a)*. By similar reasoning, *Claim (1b)* is satisfied. Furthermore, *Claim (1a)* and *(1b)* imply $\mathcal{N}_\xi \setminus \mathcal{N}_x^{\max} = \mathcal{N}_{\xi'} \setminus \mathcal{N}_x^{\min}$, and thus, *Claim (1c)* holds.

We continue with showing *Claim 2*: $\mathcal{N}_x^{\max} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_\xi$. Let $S' \in \mathcal{N}_x^{\max}$. Thus, $\max(S')_x = x$. Since $\min(S')_x < \max(S')_x$, we have $\min(S')_x \neq x$. Thus, $x \in (\xi, \xi']$ implies $\min(S')_x \leq \xi < x = \max(S')_x$, and thus, $\xi \in I(S') \cap I(S)$. Hence, $y(S', x) \geq y(S, x)$, together with Lemma 4.3, implies $y(S', \xi) \geq y(S, \xi)$, and thus, $S' \in \mathcal{N}_\xi$. Hence, *Claim (2)* holds. By similar arguments one can prove *Claim 3*: $\mathcal{N}_x^{\min} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{\xi'}$.

Finally, *Claim (2)* and *(3)* imply that $|\mathcal{N}_\xi \setminus \mathcal{N}_x^{\max}| = |\mathcal{N}_{\xi'} \setminus \mathcal{N}_x^{\min}|$ and $|\mathcal{N}_{\xi'} \setminus \mathcal{N}_x^{\min}| = |\mathcal{N}_{\xi'}| - |\mathcal{N}_x^{\min}|$, respectively. This, together with *Claim (1c)*, implies $|\mathcal{N}_\xi| - |\mathcal{N}_x^{\max}| = |\mathcal{N}_{\xi'}| - |\mathcal{N}_x^{\min}|$. \blacksquare

Lemma 4.7. *Let S be a maximal outstretched segment of a polygon P . Then, $|\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}|$ is either always odd or always even independent of the choice of $\xi \in I(S)$.*

Proof. Let S be a maximal outstretched segment of a polygon P , and let $X' := \{v_x \in I(S) \mid v \in V(P)\}$. In particular, we assume $X' = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_m\}$ to be sorted such that, for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, we have $i \leq j$ if and only if $x_i \leq x_j$. This and Lemma 3.5 implies that $x_1 = \min(S)_x \neq \max(S)_x = x_m$, and thus, $m \geq 2$. Since S is fixed, we simplify the notation and write $\mathcal{N}_\xi := \mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}$, $\mathcal{N}_\xi^{\min} := \mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}^{\min}$ and $\mathcal{N}_\xi^{\max} := \mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}^{\max}$, where $\xi \in I(S)$.

First, assume that $|X'| = 2$, i.e., $X' = \{\min(S)_x, \max(S)_x\}$. Thus, there is no $v \in V(P)$ with $\min(S)_x < v_x < \max(S)_x$, and thus, there is no $S' \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\min(S)_x < \min(S')_x, \max(S')_x < \max(S)_x$. Let $\xi, \xi' \in I(S)$ and $S' \in \mathcal{N}_\xi$. Since $S' \in \mathcal{N}_\xi$, we have $\min(S')_x \leq \xi < \max(S')_x$. Applying the previous arguments again, $\min(S')_x \leq \min(S)_x < \xi < \max(S)_x \leq \max(S')_x$. Thus, $\xi' \in I(S) \subseteq I(S')$. Moreover, $S' \in \mathcal{N}_\xi$ implies $y(S', \xi) \geq y(S, \xi)$ and thus, Lemma 4.3 yields $y(S', \xi') \geq y(S, \xi')$, and hence $S' \in \mathcal{N}_{\xi'}$. Therefore, we have $\mathcal{N}_\xi \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{\xi'}$. Interchanging the role of ξ and ξ' shows $\mathcal{N}_{\xi'} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_\xi$, and thus $\mathcal{N}_\xi = \mathcal{N}_{\xi'}$. Hence, $|\mathcal{N}_\xi|$ is either always odd or always even, independent of the choice of $\xi \in I(S)$.


Now, assume that $|X'| = m \geq 3$ and fix some $i \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$. Note that X' is a set consisting of pairwise distinct elements. Since $V(P)$ is finite, we can choose $\xi, \xi' \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $x_{i-1} < \xi < x_i \leq \xi' < x_{i+1}$ and such that $w_x \notin (\xi, \xi']$ for all $w \in V(P)$ with $w_x \neq x_i$. By definition of X' , there is at least one vertex $v \in V(P)$ with $v_x = x_i$. The latter two arguments together with Lemma 4.6 imply that $|\mathcal{N}_\xi| - |\mathcal{N}_{x_i}^{\max}| = |\mathcal{N}_{\xi'}| - |\mathcal{N}_{x_i}^{\min}|$. Since $|\mathcal{N}_{x_i}^{\min}|$ and $|\mathcal{N}_{x_i}^{\max}|$ are even by Lemma 4.5, it follows that $|\mathcal{N}_\xi|$ is even if and only if $|\mathcal{N}_{\xi'}|$ is even. Therefore, we conclude that $|\mathcal{N}_\xi|$ is either even for all $\xi \in I(S)$, or $|\mathcal{N}_\xi|$ is odd for all ξ in this interval. \blacksquare

Definition 4.8. Let S be a maximal outstretched segment of a polygon P . Then, the *parity* ϖ of S is

$$\varpi(S) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } |\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}| \text{ is even for all } \xi \in I(S) \\ 1, & \text{otherwise, i.e., } |\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}| \text{ is odd for all } \xi \in I(S) \end{cases}$$

Note that, by Lemma 4.7, $|\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}|$ is either always even or always odd for any $\xi \in I(S)$. Therefore, the parity $\varpi(S) \in \{0, 1\}$ is well-defined for every maximal outstretched segment S of P . Hence, the choice of $\xi \in I(S)$ in the definition is arbitrary. Intuitively, the parity $\varpi(S)$ determines whether $\text{Int}(P)$ is above or below the outstretched segment S : if $\varpi(S) = 0$, then $\text{Int}(P)$ is “above” the segment S , and if $\varpi(S) = 1$, then $\text{Int}(P)$ is “below” the segment S . Therefore, for a given point p , it suffices to determine the parity $\varpi(S)$ of the segment “immediately above” p to determine whether or not $p \in \text{Int}(P)$, see Fig. 2. The next result, which is a simple consequence of Lemma 4.2 and the definition of the parity function ϖ , states this observation more formally:

Figure 2: Relationships between the parity of maximal outstretched segments and location of points. The Polygon P , which bounded by the gray area, contains four maximal outstretched segments $S_1, S_2, S_3,$ and S_4 . Three sweep-lines are indicated at positions $\xi, \xi',$ and ξ'' . We observe $\xi, \xi', \xi'' \in I(S_4)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S_4} = \mathcal{N}_{\xi', S_4} = \{S_1, S_4\} \neq \{S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4\} = \mathcal{N}_{\xi'', S_4}$. Nevertheless, the cardinality of these sets is always even, and thus we have $\varpi(S_4) = 0$. In particular, the blue segments S_2 and S_4 have the parity $\varpi(S_2) = \varpi(S_4) = 0$, while the red segments S_1 and S_3 have the parity $\varpi(S_1) = \varpi(S_3) = 1$. Note that parities of consecutive segments necessarily alternate. For the three points $p \in \text{Int}(P)$ and $p', p'' \in \text{Ext}(P)$, we observe the following: (1) $p_x \in I(S_1)$ and $p_y < y(S_1, p_x)$, (2) there is no maximal outstretched segment S_i of P with $p_x \in I(S_i)$ and $p_y < y(S_i, p_x) < y(S_3, p_x)$, and (3) $\varpi(S_1) = 1$, see Prop. 4.9. No such segment exists for $p' \notin \text{Int}(P)$ and $p'' \notin \text{Int}(P)$, respectively.



Proposition 4.9. *Let P be a polygon and $p = (\xi, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus P$. Then, $p \in \text{Int}(P)$ if and only if there is a maximal outstretched segment S of P such that*

1. $\xi \in I(S)$ and $y < y(S, \xi)$,
2. there is no maximal outstretched segment S' of P with $\xi \in I(S')$ such that $y < y(S', \xi) < y(S, \xi)$,
3. $\varpi(S) = 1$.

Proof. Let P be a polygon and $p = (\xi, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus P$. By Lemma 4.2, $p \in \text{Int}(P)$ if and only if the number of maximal outstretched segments S of P that satisfies Statement (1) is odd. In particular, if $p \in \text{Int}(P)$, then there is a maximal outstretched segment S of P satisfying Statement (1). Moreover, we may choose the maximal outstretched segment S of P that satisfies Statements (1) and (2). Thus, it remains to show that, in the presence of Statements (1) and (2), $p \in \text{Int}(P)$ and $\varpi(S) = 1$ are equivalent. By assumption, p is not contained in the boundary of P , i.e., $p \notin P$. Since $\text{Int}(P)$ is an open set, $p \in \text{Int}(P)$ if and only if $p' \in \text{Int}(P)$ for all $p' \in \mathbb{R}^2$ that satisfy $\|p - p'\| < \delta$ for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$. In particular, we have $p = (\xi, y) \in \text{Int}(P)$ if and only if $p' := (\xi + \delta, y) \in \text{Int}(P)$. In this case, we have $p' \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus P$. Hence, by assumption, there is a maximal outstretched segment S' of P that satisfies Statement (1) and (2) for $(\xi + \delta, y) = p' \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus P$. Since $\delta > 0$ was sufficiently small, we can assume that $\min(S')_x \leq \xi < \xi + \delta < \max(S')_x$, i.e., $\xi + \delta \in (\min(S')_x, \max(S')_x)$. Then, by definition of $\varpi(S)$, the number of segments that satisfy Statement (1) is odd (i.e., $p' \in \text{Int}(P)$) if and only if $\varpi(S) = 1$ (i.e., Statement (3) holds), see Lemma 4.2. This, together with $p \in \text{Int}(P)$ iff $p' \in \text{Int}(P)$, implies $p \in \text{Int}(P)$ if and only if Statement (3) holds. ■

Inverting the direction of the y -axis immediately implies the following “mirror image” of Proposition 4.9:

Corollary 4.10. *Let P be a polygon and $p = (\xi, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus P$. Then, $p \in \text{Int}(P)$ if and only if there is a maximal outstretched segment S of P such that*


1. $\xi \in I(S)$ and $y > y(S, \xi)$,
2. there is no maximal outstretched segment S' of P with $\xi \in I(S')$ such that $y > y(S', \xi) > y(S, \xi)$,
3. $\varpi(S) = 0$.

The following simple consequence of Proposition 4.1 and the definition of consecutive maximal outstretched segments will be useful later on.

Corollary 4.11. *Let P be a polygon, let \mathcal{S} be the set of all maximal outstretched segments of P , and let $S \in \mathcal{S}$. If there is a $\xi \in I(S)$ such that $y(S, \xi) \geq y(S', \xi)$ for each $S' \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\xi \in I(S')$, then $\varpi(S) = 1$. Moreover, if S and $S' \in \mathcal{S}$ are consecutive, then $\varpi(S) \neq \varpi(S')$.*

Proof. Let P be a polygon, let \mathcal{S} be the set of all maximal outstretched segments of P , and let $S \in \mathcal{S}$. If there is a $\xi \in I(S)$ such that $y(S, \xi) \geq y(S', \xi)$ for each $S' \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\xi \in I(S')$, then $\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S} = \{S\}$ and, therefore, $\varpi(S) = 1$. Moreover, if S and S' are consecutive, then, by Lemma 3.12, $\min(S)_x = \min(S')_x$ or $\max(S)_x = \max(S')_x$. In the first case, we assume w.l.o.g. that $y(S, \xi) < y(S', \xi)$ for $\xi := \min(S)_x + \delta$ with $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small. Since P is simple, no other segment $S'' \in \mathcal{S}$ contains a point $(\xi, y(S'', \xi))$ with $y(S, \xi) \leq y(S'', \xi) \leq y(S', \xi)$. Hence, since $\xi \notin \{\max(S)_x, \max(S')_x\}$, we conclude $|\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S'}| - |\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}| = 1$. Thus, we can assume w.l.o.g. that $|\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S'}|$ is odd and

Figure 3: A “crossing” pair of maximal outstretched segment S_1 and S_2 implies that the corresponding polygons P_1 and P_2 overlap. In particular, there are two positions $\xi, \xi' \in I[S_1] \cap I[S_2]$ such that $y(S_1, \xi) > y(S_2, \xi)$ and $y(S_1, \xi') < y(S_2, \xi')$. Thus, S_1 and S_2 intersect (illustrated by the dashed line), and Lemma 5.4 implies that P_1 and P_2 are overlapping.



$|\mathcal{N}_{\xi, S}|$ is even. Hence, we can apply Lemma 4.7 and conclude that $|\mathcal{N}_{\xi', S'}|$ is odd for all $\xi' \in I(S)$, and $|\mathcal{N}_{\xi', S}|$ is even for all $\xi' \in I(S)$. By definition, $\varpi(S) \neq \varpi(S')$. The same conclusion follows by an analogous argument for $\max(S)_x = \max(S')_x$. ■

5. Investigating the Set of Maximally Outstretched Segments

So far, we have considered a single polygon. From here on, we focus on a set \mathcal{P} of polygons and the corresponding set $\text{Int}(\mathcal{P}) = \{\text{Int}(P) \mid P \in \mathcal{P}\}$. Since $I[P]$ is the projection of P onto the x -axis, we observe the following:

Observation 5.1. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, and $P, P' \in \mathcal{P}$. Then, $\text{Int}(P) \subseteq \text{Int}(P')$ implies $I[P] \subseteq I[P']$. Conversely, $I[P] \cap I[P'] = \emptyset$ implies $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') = \emptyset$.

Note that, in general, neither $I[P] \subseteq I[P']$ implies $\text{Int}(P) \subseteq \text{Int}(P')$ nor $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') = \emptyset$ implies $I[P] \cap I[P'] = \emptyset$; see Fig. 5 for an example. Moreover, we will make use of the following three simple result regarding the boundaries of overlap-free polygons, see Fig. 3 for an illustrative example:

Lemma 5.2. Let P and P' be two overlap-free polygons. Then, $P \cap \text{Int}(P') \neq \emptyset$ implies $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P')$ and $P \subseteq \text{Int}(P') \cup P'$. Moreover, $\text{Ext}(P') \cap P \neq \emptyset$ implies $\text{Int}(P) \not\subseteq \text{Int}(P')$. In particular, there are no $p, p' \in P$ such that $p \in \text{Int}(P')$ and $p' \in \text{Ext}(P')$.

Proof. Let P and P' be two overlap-free polygons. First, assume that $p \in P \cap \text{Int}(P')$. Hence, $p \in \text{Int}(P') \setminus \text{Int}(P) \neq \emptyset$. Since $p \in P$ is on the “boundary” of P and since $p \in \text{Int}(P')$ is *not* on the “boundary” of P' , for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a $p' \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\|p - p'\| \leq \varepsilon$ such that $p' \in \text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P')$. Hence, $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') \neq \emptyset$. This, together with $\text{Int}(P') \setminus \text{Int}(P) \neq \emptyset$ and the assumption that P and P' are overlap-free implies $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P')$. Now, assume that $p \in P \cap \text{Ext}(P')$. By similar reasoning, there is a $p' \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $p' \in \text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Ext}(P')$. This together with the assumption that P and P' are overlap-free implies $\text{Int}(P) \not\subseteq \text{Int}(P')$. In summary, $P \cap \text{Int}(P') \neq \emptyset$ and $P \cap \text{Ext}(P') \neq \emptyset$ can never occur. ■

Lemma 5.3. Let P and P' be two overlap-free polygons such that $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') \neq \emptyset$. Then, $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P')$ if and only if $\text{area}(P) < \text{area}(P')$. In particular, $P = P'$ if and only if $\text{area}(P) = \text{area}(P')$.


Proof. Since polygons are overlap-free, $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') \neq \emptyset$ implies $P = P'$, $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P')$ or $\text{Int}(P') \subsetneq \text{Int}(P)$. Clearly, $\text{Int}(P) \subseteq \text{Int}(P')$ implies $\text{area}(P) \leq \text{area}(P')$. Since two polygons are different only if their vertex sets differ, $P \neq P'$ and $\text{Int}(P) \subseteq \text{Int}(P')$ implies that there is vertex $v \in V(P)$ such that $v \in \text{Int}(P')$, and thus $\text{area}(P) < \text{area}(P')$. Thus, $\text{Int}(P) \subseteq \text{Int}(P')$ and $\text{area}(P) = \text{area}(P')$ implies $P = P'$. ■

Lemma 5.4. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of overlap-free polygons and $P, P' \in \mathcal{P}$. Moreover, let S and S' be maximal outstretched segments of P and P' , respectively. Then, we have $y(S, \xi) \leq y(S', \xi)$ for all $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$, or $y(S', \xi) \leq y(S, \xi)$ for all $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$.

Proof. Let $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$. If $P = P'$, the statement follows from Lemma 4.3. Hence, suppose that $P \neq P'$. Now, assume for contradiction that there are two $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in I[S] \cap I[S']$ such that $y(S', \xi_1) > y(S, \xi_1)$ and $y(S', \xi_2) < y(S, \xi_2)$. We may assume w.l.o.g. that $\xi_1 < \xi_2$. By similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma 4.3, the intermediate-value-theorem implies that the intersection $\widehat{S}^* := \widehat{S} \cap \widehat{S}'$ with $\widehat{S} := \{p \in S \mid \xi_1 \leq p_x \leq \xi_2\}$ and $\widehat{S}' := \{p \in S' \mid$

Figure 4: Sweep-adjacency in a set $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4, P_5\}$ of polygons. We have $\text{Int}(P_5) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P_4)$, and $\text{Int}(P_i) \cap \text{Int}(P_j) = \emptyset$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$ with $\{i, j\} \neq \{4, 5\}$. The parities of their maximal outstretched segments S_i are colored red if there is a polygon P_j with $\varpi(S_i, P_j) = 1$, and are colored blue if there is a polygon P_j with $\varpi(S_i, P_j) = 0$. Note that the parity of segment depends on the segments to which it belongs: The S_2 appears in both P_1 and P_2 with distinct parities $\varpi(S_2, P_1) = 1 \neq 0 = \varpi(S_2, P_2)$. Such (parts of) segments are shown as blue-red-dashed lines. Note, furthermore, that $S_4 \subseteq S_3$ with $(S_3, P_2), (S_4, P_3) \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$.

Sweep-adjacency of maximal outstretched segments is determined for pairs of polygons: First, (S_2, P_2) is only sweep-adjacent to (S_2, P_1) (witnessed by ξ_1) but not to any other $(S_i, P_j) \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$. In contrast, (S_2, P_1) is sweep-adjacent to (S_2, P_2) and (S_4, P_3) (witnessed by ξ_1). Moreover, (S_5, P_3) and (S_6, P_4) (resp., (S_9, P_3) and (S_8, P_4)) are sweep-adjacent (witnessed by ξ_2). Hence, $(*, P_i)$ and $(*, P_j)$ with $i \neq j$, which are sweep-adjacent, are not necessarily unique. Finally, note that (S_8, P_5) and (S_{11}, P_3) are sweep-adjacent witnessed by ξ_3 . However, their sweep-adjacency is neither witness by ξ_2 (since Def. 5.6 (2) is violated) nor by ξ_4 (since Def. 5.6 (1) is violated).



$\{\xi_1 \leq p_x \leq \xi_2\}$ is non-empty. In particular, it is easy to verify that ξ_1 and ξ_2 can be chosen such that the intersection \widehat{S}^* is connected. Note that \widehat{S}^* is not necessarily an isolated point and may involve vertical edges. Moreover, $\widehat{S}' \setminus \widehat{S}^*$ decomposes into exactly two segments \widehat{S}'_1 and \widehat{S}'_2 , where w.l.o.g. $p_1 := (\xi_1, y(S, \xi_1)) \in \widehat{S}'_1$ and $p_2 := (\xi_2, y(S, \xi_2)) \in \widehat{S}'_2$. Moreover, Prop. 3.8 (2) implies that any sufficiently small open neighborhood U of \widehat{S}^* does not intersect with other maximal outstretched segment of P and P' , i.e., for a sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, we have $U := \{p \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \|p - p'\| < \delta \text{ for some } p' \in \widehat{S}^*\}$. Since $\widehat{S}' = \widehat{S}'_1 \cup \widehat{S}^* \cup \widehat{S}'_2$, it is straightforward to verify that there is a $p'_1 \in \widehat{S}'_1 \cap U$ and $p'_2 \in \widehat{S}'_2 \cap U$. In particular, $p'_1, p'_2 \notin S$, and thus, $(p'_1)_y \neq y(S, (p'_1)_x)$ and $(p'_2)_y \neq y(S, (p'_2)_x)$. Moreover, $p'_1, p'_2 \notin S$, together with $p'_1, p'_2 \in U$, implies $p'_1, p'_2 \notin P$.

Now, assume for contradiction that $(p'_1)_y < y(S, (p'_1)_x)$, and thus, $(p'_1)_y < y(S, (p'_1)_x) = y(\widehat{S}, (p'_1)_x)$. This, together with $p'_1 \in \widehat{S}'_1$ and $y(\widehat{S}'_1, \xi_1) = y(S', \xi_1) > y(S, \xi_1) = y(\widehat{S}, \xi_1)$, implies $\widehat{S}'_1 \cap \widehat{S} \neq \emptyset$. In particular, there is a $p \in \widehat{S} \cap \widehat{S}'_1 \subseteq \widehat{S} \cap \widehat{S}'$ with $p \notin \widehat{S}^*$; a contradiction to $\widehat{S}^* = \widehat{S} \cap \widehat{S}'$. Hence, $(p'_1)_y > y(S, (p'_1)_x)$, i.e., Statement (1) of Cor. 4.10 is satisfied; and since $p'_1 \in U$, Statement (2) of Cor. 4.10 is satisfied. This, together with Cor. 4.10, implies $p'_1 \in \text{Int}(P)$ if and only if $\varpi(S, P) = 0$. By analogous arguments, we conclude that $(p'_2)_y < y(S, (p'_2)_x)$, i.e., Statement (1) of Prop. 4.9 is satisfied; and since $p'_2 \in U$, Statement (2) of Prop. 4.9 is satisfied. Hence, Prop. 4.9 implies $p'_2 \in \text{Int}(P)$ if and only if $\varpi(S, P) = 1$. Since $p'_1, p'_2 \notin P$, we have $p'_1, p'_2 \in \text{Int}(P) \cup \text{Ext}(P)$. Thus, $p'_2 \in \text{Int}(P)$ and $p'_1 \in \text{Ext}(P)$ if $\varpi(S, P) = 1$, and $p'_1 \in \text{Int}(P)$ and $p'_2 \in \text{Ext}(P)$, otherwise (i.e., $\varpi(S, P) = 0$).

Independent of $\varpi(S, P)$, therefore there are $p, p' \in \widehat{S}' \cap U \subseteq S' \subseteq P'$ with $p \in \text{Int}(P)$ and $p' \in \text{Ext}(P)$. This, Lemma 5.2 and the fact that P and P' are overlap-free implies a contradiction. Hence, we have $y(S, \xi) \leq y(S', \xi)$ for all $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$, or $y(S', \xi) \leq y(S, \xi)$ for all $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$. ■

Remark 5.5. From here on, all sets \mathcal{P} of polygons are considered to be overlap-free.

Since a segment S may be part of two or more polygons, we now use pairs (S, P) in order identify the polygon P of which S is considered to be a maximal outstretched segment. We write $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ for the set of all pairs (S, P) of maximal outstretched segments $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and their polygons $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Moreover, we set

$$(\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P}) := \{(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P}) \mid \xi \in I[S]\}.$$

A segment S that is contained in two polygons P and P' might be maximal outstretched in P but not in P' . Hence, $(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ does not necessarily imply $(S, P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ even if S is a segment of P' as well. Thus, in general, $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P}) \neq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{P}$. Furthermore, note that the parity of S depends on P , hence we write $\varpi(S, P)$ from here on.

In this section, we are interested of the “relative position” of two polygons P and P' , i.e. $\text{Int}(P) \subseteq \text{Int}(P')$, $\text{Int}(P) \subseteq \text{Int}(P')$ or $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') = \emptyset$. To this end, we introduce the concept of “sweep-adjacency”, which is illustrated in Fig. 4.

Definition 5.6. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ with $P \neq P'$. Then, we call (S, P) and (S', P') *sweep-adjacent* if there is a $\xi \in I(S) \cap I(S')$ such that there is no $(S'', P'') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ with $P'' \in \{P, P'\}$, and

$$y(S, \xi) < y(S'', \xi) < y(S', \xi) \text{ or } y(S, \xi) > y(S'', \xi) > y(S', \xi).$$

In this case, we say that ξ is a *witness* for the sweep-adjacency of (S, P) and (S', P') .

Note that $\min(S)_x$ and $\min(S')_x$ need to be excluded from $I(S) \cap I(S')$, since there is another segment $(S'', P) \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ with $\min(S'') = \min(S)$ (resp., $(S'', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ with $\min(S'') = \min(S')$), which would lead to ambiguities. Moreover, in order to get some intuition, we observe the following:

Observation 5.7. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, $P, P' \in \mathcal{P}$ with $P \neq P'$, and $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$. Then, the existence of a $\xi \in I(S) \cap I(S')$ with $y(S, \xi) = y(S', \xi)$ implies (a) that $p := (\xi, y(S, \xi)) = (\xi, y(S', \xi)) \in S \cap S'$, and (b) that (S, P) and (S', P') are sweep-adjacent. However, $p \in S \cap S'$ with $p_x \in I(S) \cap I(S')$ does *not* imply that (S, P) and (S', P') are sweep-adjacent; see Fig. 5 for an illustrative example.

Lemma 5.8. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and $P, P' \in \mathcal{P}$. Then, there is a sweep-adjacent pair $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ if and only if $I[P] \cap I[P'] \neq \emptyset$ and $P \neq P'$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, $P, P' \in \mathcal{P}$ with $P \neq P'$. If $I[P] \cap I[P'] = \emptyset$, then there is no ξ such that $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$, and thus, in particular, no sweep-adjacent pair of segments exists. Conversely, we assume $I[P] \cap I[P'] \neq \emptyset$. Since $I[P]$ and $I[P']$ are semi-open to the right, so is their intersection, and thus there is an open interval $J \subseteq I[P] \cap I[P'] \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, $J' := J \setminus \{v_x \mid v \in V(P) \cup V(P')\} \neq \emptyset$, and for every $\xi \in J'$, we have $\mathcal{S} := \{S \mid (S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})\}$ and $\mathcal{S}' := \{S' \mid (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})\}$ are non-empty. Now, choose $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and $S' \in \mathcal{S}'$ such that $|y(S, \xi) - y(S', \xi)|$ is minimal. It follows immediately that (S, P) and (S', P') are sweep-adjacent. ■

Lemma 5.9. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, and let $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ be sweep-adjacent witnessed by ξ . Then, there exists a sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ such that sweep-adjacency is also witnessed by $\xi + \delta$ and $\xi - \delta$. In particular, there is always a witness $\xi' \in I(S) \cap I(S')$ with $\xi' \neq v_x$ for all $v \in V(P) \cup V(P')$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, and let $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ be a sweep-adjacent pair witnessed by ξ and we assume w.l.o.g. $y(S, \xi) \leq y(S', \xi)$. Hence, Def. 5.6 implies $\xi \in I(S) \cap I(S')$. This, together with $I(S) \cap I(S')$ being an open interval, implies that there is a sufficiently small open neighborhood U of ξ such that $U \subseteq I(S) \cap I(S')$ and $(\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P}) = (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi'}, \mathcal{P})$ for all $\xi' \in U$. In particular, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that (a) $\xi \pm \delta \in U$ and (b) $\xi \pm \delta \neq v_x$ for all $v \in V(P) \cup V(P')$. Moreover, by Def. 5.6, there is no $(S'', P'') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ with $P'' \in \{P, P'\}$ and $y(S, \xi) < y(S'', \xi) < y(S', \xi)$. This, together with $(\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P}) = (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi \pm \delta}, \mathcal{P})$ and Lemma 5.4, implies that there is no $(S'', P'') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ with $P'' \in \{P, P'\}$ and $y(S, \xi') < y(S'', \xi') < y(S', \xi')$. Hence, $\xi \pm \delta$ is also a witness for the sweep-adjacency of (S, P) and (S', P') . ■

Now, we proceed by showing how sweep-adjacent maximally outstretched segments can be used to determine the relative location of their polygons. First, we characterize when two polygons have a (non-)empty intersection of their interiors.

Lemma 5.10. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, and $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ be sweep-adjacent. Then, $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P')$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, and let $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ be sweep-adjacent. Then, by Lemma 5.9, the sweep-adjacency can be witnessed by a $\xi \in I(S) \cap I(S')$ with $\xi \neq v_x$ for all $v \in V(S) \cup V(S')$. Moreover, we may assume w.l.o.g. that $y(S, \xi) \leq y(S', \xi)$. In the following, we consider the points $p := (\xi, y(S, \xi) - \delta)$ and $p' := (\xi, y(S', \xi) + \delta)$ for some sufficiently small $\delta > 0$. By the choice of ξ , we have $\xi \neq v_x$ for all $v \in V(S) \cup V(S')$. This implies that p and p' cannot be on a vertical edge of P or P' . Hence, since $\delta > 0$ is sufficiently small, we have $p, p' \notin P \cup P'$. Since (S, P) and (S', P') are sweep-adjacent, it is easy to verify that p and p' always satisfies Conditions (1) and (2) of Proposition 4.9 and Corollary 4.10, respectively. Hence, $p \in \text{Int}(P)$ iff $\varpi(S, P) = 1$ and $p \in \text{Int}(P')$ iff $\varpi(S', P') = 1$,




Figure 5: Intersection of maximal outstretched segments does not imply sweep-adjacency as shown by the maximal outstretched segments S_1 of P_1 and S_2 of P_2 . We observe $\text{Int}(P_1) \cap \text{Int}(P_2) = \emptyset$ and $I[P_1] = I[P_2]$, and $V(S_1) \cap V(S_2) \neq \emptyset$ and $E(S_1) \cap E(S_2) \neq \emptyset$. It is easy to verify that for every $\xi \in I[S_1] \cap I[S_2]$, we have either $y(S_1, \xi) > y(S'_1, \xi) > y(S_2, \xi)$ (if $p_x \leq \xi$), or $y(S_1, \xi) > y(S'_2, \xi) > y(S_2, \xi)$ (otherwise). Hence, for all $\xi \in I[S_1] \cap I[S_2]$, the condition of Def. 5.6 is not satisfied; and thus, (S_1, P_1) and (S_2, P_2) cannot be sweep-adjacent. Hence, neither $V(S_1) \cap V(S_2) \neq \emptyset$ nor $E(S_1) \cap E(S_2) \neq \emptyset$ is not sufficient to imply sweep-adjacency.

resp., $p' \in \text{Int}(P)$ iff $\varpi(S, P) = 0$ and $p' \in \text{Int}(P')$ iff $\varpi(S', P') = 0$. Thus, in either case, $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P')$ implies $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') \neq \emptyset$.

Now, suppose $\varpi(S, P) \neq \varpi(S', P')$. Then, we distinguish two cases: (i) $\varpi(S, P) = 0$ and $\varpi(S', P') = 1$, and (ii) $\varpi(S, P) = 1$ and $\varpi(S', P') = 0$. In Case (i), we have $p' \in \text{Int}(P)$, $p \notin \text{Int}(P)$, $p \in \text{Int}(P')$, and $p \notin \text{Int}(P')$, and thus $p \in \text{Int}(P') \setminus \text{Int}(P)$ and $p' \in \text{Int}(P) \setminus \text{Int}(P')$. In Case (ii), we have $p \in \text{Int}(P)$ and $p' \notin \text{Int}(P)$, $p' \in \text{Int}(P')$ and $p \notin \text{Int}(P')$, i.e., $p \in \text{Int}(P) \setminus \text{Int}(P')$ and $p' \in \text{Int}(P') \setminus \text{Int}(P)$. In both cases, the fact that $\text{Int}(P)$ and $\text{Int}(P')$ are overlap-free implies that $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') = \emptyset$. Therefore, $\varpi(S, P) \neq \varpi(S', P')$ implies $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') = \emptyset$. ■

The combination of Obs. 5.7 and Lemma 5.10 shows that the intersection of two polygons is determined by the parity of a pair sweep-adjacent maximally outstretched segments or their non-existence. Lemmas 5.3 and 5.10 together imply

Corollary 5.11. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, and suppose that $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ are sweep-adjacent. Then, $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P')$ if and only if $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P')$ and $\text{area}(P) < \text{area}(P')$.*

We formalize the idea that segments are “below” of other segments in the following manner:

Definition 5.12. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ and $I[S] \cap I[S'] \neq \emptyset$. Note that $P = P'$ is possible. Then, (S, P) is *below* (S', P') if there is $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$ such that $y(S, \xi) < y(S', \xi)$.

Observation 5.13. Note that if $y(S, \xi) \neq y(S', \xi)$ for some $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$, then we have by Lemma 5.4 either (S, P) is below (S', P') , or *vice versa*. In this case, we have $S \neq S'$.

Proposition 5.14. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, let $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ be sweep-adjacent as witnessed by some ξ with $\xi \neq v_x$ for all $v \in V(S) \cup V(S')$, and $y(S, \xi) \neq y(S', \xi)$. Then, we have $y(S, \xi) < y(S', \xi)$ if and only if one of the following statements hold:*

1. $\varpi(S, P) = 1$ and $\varpi(S', P') = 0$;
2. $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P') = 1$ and $\text{area}(P) < \text{area}(P')$, or
3. $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P') = 0$ and $\text{area}(P) > \text{area}(P')$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, let $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ be sweep-adjacent as witnessed by some ξ , and $y(S, \xi) < y(S', \xi)$. Then, consider the points $p := (\xi, y(S, \xi) - \delta)$, $p' := (\xi, y(S', \xi) + \delta)$ for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, and $p'' := (\xi, \frac{1}{2}(y(S, \xi) + y(S', \xi)))$. By assumption, we have $\xi \neq v_x$ for all $v \in V(S) \cup V(S')$. This implies that p and p' cannot be on a vertical edge of P or P' . Hence, since $\delta > 0$ is sufficiently small, we have $p, p' \notin P \cup P'$. Since (S, P) and (S', P') are sweep-adjacent witnessed by ξ , we can immediately apply Proposition 4.9 and Corollary 4.10 to determine whether or not p, p' , and p'' are located within $\text{Int}(P)$ and $\text{Int}(P')$. Then, assume for contradiction that $\varpi(S, P) = 0$ and $\varpi(S', P') = 1$. In this case, it holds that $p' \in \text{Int}(P)$, $p \notin \text{Int}(P)$ and $p'' \in \text{Int}(P)$, as well as $p \in \text{Int}(P')$, $p' \notin \text{Int}(P')$ and $p'' \in \text{Int}(P')$. Thus, $p'' \in \text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P')$, $p \in \text{Int}(P') \setminus \text{Int}(P)$ and $p' \in \text{Int}(P) \setminus \text{Int}(P')$ implies a contradiction, since P and P' are overlap-free. Hence, if $\varpi(S, P) \neq \varpi(S', P')$, then $y(S, \xi) < y(S', \xi)$ iff $\varpi(S, P) = 1$ and $\varpi(S', P') = 0$. Moreover, if $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P') = 1$, then $p \in \text{Int}(P)$, $p, p'' \in \text{Int}(P')$ and $p' \notin \text{Int}(P)$, which is true iff $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P')$, and thus iff $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') \neq \emptyset$ and $\text{area}(P) < \text{area}(P')$. Hence, if $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P') = 1$,

then $y(S, \xi) < y(S', \xi)$ iff $\text{area}(P) < \text{area}(P')$. Finally, if $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P') = 0$, then $p' \in \text{Int}(P')$, $p', p'' \in \text{Int}(P)$, $p'' \notin \text{Int}(P')$, which is true iff $\text{Int}(P') \subsetneq \text{Int}(P)$, and thus iff $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') \neq \emptyset$ and $\text{area}(P') < \text{area}(P)$. Hence, if $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P') = 0$, then $y(S, \xi) < y(S', \xi)$ iff $\text{area}(P) > \text{area}(P')$. ■

Corollary 5.15. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, and let $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ be sweep-adjacent. If (S, P) is below (S', P') , then (S, P) and (S', P') satisfy one of the Statements (1) to (3) in Proposition 5.14.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, and let $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ be sweep-adjacent. Then, by Lemma 5.9, the sweep-adjacency can be witnessed by a $\xi \in I(S) \cap I(S')$ with $\xi \neq v_x$ for all $v \in V(S) \cup V(S')$. Moreover, by definition of sweep-adjacency, $P \neq P'$. We assume that (S, P) is below (S', P') . If $y(S, \xi) \neq y(S', \xi)$, then we can use Proposition 5.14, and we are done. Now, assume that $y(S, \xi) = y(S', \xi)$. Since (S, P) is below (S', P') , there is a $\xi' \in I[S] \cap I[S']$ with $y(S, \xi') \neq y(S', \xi')$. We may assume w.l.o.g. that $\xi < \xi'$. Then, consider $\xi'' \in [\xi, \xi']$ such that $|\xi'' - \xi|$ is maximal and $y(S, \xi'') = y(S', \xi'')$ for all $\xi''' \in [\xi, \xi'']$. In particular, for a sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, the sweep-adjacency of (S, P) and (S', P') can be witnessed by $\xi'' + \delta$. By the choice of $\xi'' + \delta$, we conclude that $y(S, \xi'' + \delta) \neq y(S', \xi'' + \delta)$, and $\xi'' + \delta \neq v_x$ for all $v \in V(S) \cup V(S')$. Hence, Proposition 5.14 can be applied. ■

Recall that the intervals $I[e]$ of the non-vertical edges e of an outstretched segment S of P form a partition of $I[S]$. Hence, for every $\xi \in I[S]$, there is a unique non-vertical edge $e \in E(S)$ such that $\xi \in I[e]$. Therefore, we define the *slope* of S for each $\xi \in I[S]$ as the slope of the unique non-vertical edge $e = \{u, v\}$ with $\xi \in I[e]$ as

$$\Delta(S, \xi) := \frac{u_y - v_y}{u_x - v_x}.$$

The slope $\Delta(S, \xi)$ can be used to determine, for two outstretched segments (S, P) and (S', P') that share a common point (x, y) with $x \in I[S] \cap I[S']$ whether S lies above or below S' . To be more precise:

Lemma 5.16. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, and let $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ such that $y(S, \xi) = y(S', \xi)$ and $\Delta(S, \xi) \neq \Delta(S', \xi)$ for some $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$. Then, $\Delta(S, \xi) < \Delta(S', \xi)$ if and only if (S, P) is below (S', P') .*

Proof. Let $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ as specified in the lemma. First, assume that $\Delta(S, \xi) < \Delta(S', \xi)$. In particular, for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, we have $\xi' := \xi + \delta \in I[S] \cap I[S']$. Therefore, we have $y(S, \xi') = y + \Delta(S, \xi) \cdot \delta < y + \Delta(S', \xi) \cdot \delta = y(S', \xi')$, i.e., (S, P) is below (S', P') . For the converse, assume by contraposition that $\Delta(S, \xi) > \Delta(S', \xi)$. By similar arguments, (S', P') must be below (S, P) . By Observation 5.13, (S, P) cannot be below (S', P') . ■

6. Ordering the Set of Maximally Outstretched Segments

The discussion in Section 5 motivates the definition of the following order of maximally outstretched segments along a sweep-line at ξ :

Definition 6.1. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, we define the relation \prec_ξ on $(\mathcal{S}_\xi, \mathcal{P})$ by setting $(S', P') \prec_\xi (S, P)$ whenever

- (1a) $y(S', \xi) > y(S, \xi)$, or
- (1b) $y(S', \xi) = y(S, \xi)$ and
 - (2a) $\Delta(S', \xi) > \Delta(S, \xi)$, or
 - (2b) $\Delta(S', \xi) = \Delta(S, \xi)$ and
 - (3a) $\varpi(S', P') = 0$ and $\varpi(S, P) = 1$, or
 - (3b) $\varpi(S', P') = \varpi(S, P) = 1$ and $\text{area}(P) < \text{area}(P')$, or
 - (3c) $\varpi(S', P') = \varpi(S, P) = 0$ and $\text{area}(P) > \text{area}(P')$.

For an illustrative example of Def. 6.1, see Fig. 4. There, we have $(S_{12}, P_3) \prec_{\xi_1} (S_1, P_1)$ due to Def. 6.1 (1), $(S_8, P_5) \prec_{\xi_2} (S_7, P_5)$ due to Def. 6.1 (2a), $(S_4, P_3) \prec_{\xi_2} (S_3, P_2)$ due to Def. 6.1 (3a), and $(S_8, P_4) \prec_{\xi_3} (S_8, P_5)$ due to Def. 6.1 (3b). Next, we proceed by showing that \prec_ξ is a total order on the set of maximal outstretched segments intersecting a sweep-line at ξ . To this end, we first express equality in terms of the quantities appearing in Def. 6.1.

Lemma 6.2. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_\xi, \mathcal{P})$. Then, $(S, P) = (S', P')$ if and only if $y(S, \xi) = y(S', \xi)$, $\Delta(S, \xi) = \Delta(S', \xi)$, $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P')$ and $\text{area}(P) = \text{area}(P')$.*

Proof. Clearly, the condition is necessary. To establish the sufficiency, we consider the shared point $p := (\xi, y(S, \xi)) = (\xi, y(S', \xi))$ and the same slope $\Delta(S, \xi) = \Delta(S', \xi)$. For sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, we have $p' := (\xi', y(S, \xi')) = (\xi', y(S', \xi'))$ with $\xi' := \xi + \delta$. In particular, since $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ and δ is sufficiently small, we have $\xi' \in I[S] \cap I[S']$ and $\min(S)_x \leq \xi < \xi + \delta = \xi' < \max(S)_x$ and $\min(S')_x \leq \xi < \xi + \delta = \xi' < \max(S')_x$. Hence, Obs. 5.7 implies that (S, P) and (S', P') are sweep-adjacent. This, together with $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P')$ and Lemma 5.10, implies $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') \neq \emptyset$. Now, $\text{area}(P) = \text{area}(P')$ and Lemma 5.3 imply $P = P'$. Finally, if S and S' are two maximal outstretched segments of the same polygon $P = P'$ with the common vertex $p' \in S \cap S'$, then Proposition 3.8 implies $S = S'$. Hence, $(S, P) = (S', P')$. ■

Lemma 6.3. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygon. Then, the relation \prec_{ξ} specified in Def. 6.1 is a strict total order on $(\mathcal{S}_{\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygon and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $(S, P), (S', P'), (S'', P'') \in (\mathcal{S}_{\xi}, \mathcal{P})$. First, it is obvious from the definition that \prec_{ξ} is antisymmetric, that is, $(S, P) \prec_{\xi} (S', P')$ implies that $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$ must not hold. Moreover, we have neither $(S, P) \prec_{\xi} (S', P')$ nor $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$ if and only if $y(S, \xi) = y(S', \xi)$, $\Delta(S, \xi) = \Delta(S', \xi)$, $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P')$ and $\text{area}(P) = \text{area}(P')$. By Lemma 6.2, this is exactly the case if $(S, P) = (S', P')$. Thus, \prec_{ξ} is trichotomous, that is, for all $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ we have either (i) $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$, (ii) $(S, P) \prec_{\xi} (S', P')$ or (iii) $(S', P') = (S, P)$.

It remains to show that \prec_{ξ} is transitive. To this end, let $(S, P) \prec_{\xi} (S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S'', P'')$. If the first or the second inequality is realized by Case (1a) or (1b) and (2a), then $(S, P) \prec_{\xi} (S'', P'')$ follows from transitivity of $<$ on \mathbb{R} . It remains to consider $y(S, \xi) = y(S', \xi) = y(S'', \xi)$ and $\Delta(S, \xi) = \Delta(S', \xi) = \Delta(S'', \xi)$. First, assume $\varpi(S, P) = 0$ and $\varpi(S', P') = 1$. Then, $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S'', P'')$ leaves only case (3b), i.e., $\varpi(S', P') = \varpi(S'', P'') = 1$ and thus, $(S, P) \prec_{\xi} (S'', P'')$ according to (3a). If $\varpi(S', P') = 0$ and $\varpi(S'', P'') = 1$, then $(S, P) \prec_{\xi} (S', P')$ implies, via (3c) $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P') = 0$ and $(S, P) \prec_{\xi} (S'', P'')$ by (3a). Note that, by definition of \prec_{ξ} , the case $\varpi(S, P) = 1$ and $\varpi(S, P) \neq \varpi(S', P')$ or $\varpi(S, P) \neq \varpi(S'', P'')$ cannot occur. Hence, it remains to consider the case that $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P') = \varpi(S'', P'')$. For even parity $\varpi(S, P) = 0$, we have $\text{area}(P) < \text{area}(P') < \text{area}(P'')$ and thus $(S, P) \prec_{\xi} (S'', P'')$ by (3c). For odd parity $\varpi(S, P) = 1$, we have $\text{area}(P) > \text{area}(P') > \text{area}(P'')$ and thus $(S, P) \prec_{\xi} (S'', P'')$ by (3b). ■

Next, we show that \prec_{ξ} is consistent with the notion of a maximally outstretched segment being below another.

Lemma 6.4. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$. If there is some $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$ with $y(S, \xi) \neq y(S', \xi)$, then (S, P) is below (S', P') if and only if $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$ for all $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$. In particular, for every $\xi, \xi' \in I[S] \cap I[S']$, we have $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$ if and only if $(S', P') \prec_{\xi'} (S, P)$.*

Proof. Let $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ be specified as in the lemma.

First, we assume that (S, P) is below (S', P') and thus, $(S, P) \neq (S', P')$. Let $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$ be chosen arbitrarily. If $y(S, \xi) \neq y(S', \xi)$, then $y(S, \xi) < y(S', \xi)$, and thus, $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$. Moreover, if $y(S', \xi) = y(S, \xi)$ and $\Delta(S', \xi) \neq \Delta(S, \xi)$, then Lemma 5.16 implies $\Delta(S, \xi) < \Delta(S', \xi)$, and thus, $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$. Now, assume that $y(S', \xi) = y(S, \xi)$ and $\Delta(S', \xi) = \Delta(S, \xi)$. Hence, there is a $p \in S \cap S'$ with $p_x \neq v_x$ for all $v \in V(S) \cup V(S')$. Thus, if $P = P'$, then we would conclude by Prop. 3.8 that $S = S'$; a contradiction to $(S', P') \neq (S, P)$. Hence, $P \neq P'$. The latter two observations allow us to use Obs. 5.7, and we conclude that (S, P) and (S', P') are sweep-adjacent. Hence, by virtue of Corollary 5.15, (S, P) below (S', P') implies $\varpi(S', P') = 0$ and $\varpi(S, P) = 1$, or $\varpi(S', P') = \varpi(S, P) = 1$ and $\text{area}(P) < \text{area}(P')$, or $\varpi(S', P') = \varpi(S, P) = 0$ and $\text{area}(P) > \text{area}(P')$, and thus $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$. In either case, we have $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$. Conversely, assume that $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$ for all $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$. In particular, we have $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$ for $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$ with $y(S, \xi) \neq y(S', \xi)$. Hence, $y(S, \xi) < y(S', \xi)$, and thus, (S, P) is below (S', P') .

Now, let $\xi, \xi' \in I[S] \cap I[S']$. If there is a $\xi'' \in I[S] \cap I[S']$ with $y(S, \xi'') \neq y(S', \xi'')$, then either (i) $y(S', \xi'') < y(S, \xi'')$ or (ii) $y(S', \xi'') > y(S, \xi'')$. In Case (i) (S, P) is below (S', P') , and in Case (ii) (S', P') is below (S, P) . Hence, application of the afore-established results show that, in Case (i), we have $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$ and $(S', P') \prec_{\xi'} (S, P)$ and, in Case (ii), $(S, P) \prec_{\xi} (S', P')$ and $(S, P) \prec_{\xi'} (S', P')$. Now, assume that $y(S, \xi'') = y(S', \xi'')$ for every $\xi'' \in I[S] \cap I[S']$. Then, it is easy to see that $y(S, \xi) = y(S', \xi)$, $\Delta(S, \xi) = \Delta(S', \xi)$, $y(S, \xi') = y(S', \xi')$ and $\Delta(S, \xi') = \Delta(S', \xi')$. This, together with the definition of \prec_{ξ} and the fact that the parity $\varpi(S, P)$ and $\varpi(S', P')$ is independent from ξ and ξ' , implies $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$ if and only if $(S', P') \prec_{\xi'} (S, P)$. In summary, for all $\xi, \xi' \in I[S] \cap I[S']$, we have $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$ if and only if $(S', P') \prec_{\xi'} (S, P)$. ■

Note that Lemma 6.4 requires that there is a $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$ with $y(S, \xi) \neq y(S', \xi)$. However, segments may be \leq_{ξ} comparable without one being below the other. This is (precisely) the case if S and S' coincide on $I[S] \cap I[S']$. In particular, the total order \leq_{ξ} on $(\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ extends to a partial order \prec on $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ by setting $(S, P) \prec (S', P')$ whenever $(S, P) \leq_{\xi} (S', P')$ for some $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$.

Moreover, we say $(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ is \leq_{ξ} -minimal w.r.t. P if $(S, P) \leq_{\xi} (S', P')$ for all $(S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ with $S \neq S'$. An immediate consequence of Corollary 4.11 will be useful in the following:

Corollary 6.5. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and let $(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ be \leq_{ξ} -minimal w.r.t. P . Then, $\varpi(S, P) = 1$.*

The key observation of this section is that the parities $\varpi(S, P)$ and $\varpi(S', P')$ of two maximal outstretched segments (S, P) and (S', P') of distinct polygon P and P' that are encountered consecutively along a sweep-line at ξ , i.e., consecutively w.r.t. the \leq_{ξ} order, determine the relative position of P and P' and their arrangement in the nesting forest $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P})$. To this end, we need the following definition:

Definition 6.6. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ with $P \neq P'$. Then, (S, P) and (S', P') are \leq_{ξ} -adjacent if there is no $(S'', P'') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ with $P'' \in \{P, P'\}$, and

$$(S, P) \leq_{\xi} (S'', P'') \leq_{\xi} (S', P') \text{ or } (S', P') \leq_{\xi} (S'', P'') \leq_{\xi} (S, P).$$

The following simple observation allows us to replace sweep-adjacency by \leq_{ξ} -adjacency. This has the advantage that \leq_{ξ} -adjacency can be easily evaluated for all $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$, and thus in particular for the vertices of the polygons.

Lemma 6.7. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, and $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ be \leq_{ξ} -adjacent with $P \neq P'$. Then, (S, P) and (S', P') are sweep-adjacent. In particular, for a sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, the (S, P) and (S', P') are also $\leq_{\xi'}$ -adjacent with $\xi' := \xi + \delta$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ be \leq_{ξ} -adjacent with $P \neq P'$. We assume w.l.o.g. $(S', P') \leq_{\xi} (S, P)$. Now, consider a sufficiently small $\delta > 0$. Then, it is easy to verify that $\xi' := \xi + \delta \in I[S] \cap I[S']$ and $(\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P}) = (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi'}, \mathcal{P})$. Moreover, by definition of \leq_{ξ} -adjacency, there is no $(S'', P'') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ with $P'' \in \{P, P'\}$ and $(S, P) \leq_{\xi} (S'', P'') \leq_{\xi} (S', P')$. The latter two observations, together with Lemma 6.4, imply that (S, P) and (S', P') are also $\leq_{\xi'}$ -adjacent. In particular, there is no $(S'', P'') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi'}, \mathcal{P})$ with $P'' \in \{P, P'\}$ and $y(S, \xi') < y(S'', \xi') < y(S', \xi')$. This, together with $\xi' \in I[S] \cap I[S']$, implies (S, P) and (S', P') are sweep-adjacent witnessed by ξ' . ■

Now, we are in the position to show that the \leq_{ξ} order and the parity of two \leq_{ξ} -adjacent maximally outstretched segments determines the inclusion order their respective polygons.

Proposition 6.8. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and $(S', P'), (S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ be \leq_{ξ} -adjacent with $P \neq P'$. If $(S', P') \leq_{\xi} (S, P)$, then the following three statements hold:*

1. $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') = \emptyset$ if and only if $\varpi(S', P') = 0$ and $\varpi(S, P) = 1$.
2. $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P')$ if and only if $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P') = 1$.
3. $\text{Int}(P') \subsetneq \text{Int}(P)$ if and only if $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P') = 0$.

In particular, the case $\varpi(S', P') = 1$ and $\varpi(S, P) = 0$ can never occur.

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and $(S', P'), (S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ be \leq_{ξ} -adjacent with $P \neq P'$, and let $(S', P') \leq_{\xi} (S, P)$. First, assume that there is a $\xi' \in I[S] \cap I[S']$ such that $y(S, \xi') \neq y(S', \xi')$. Then, Lemma 6.4, together with $(S', P') \leq_{\xi} (S, P)$, implies $(S', P') \leq_{\xi'} (S, P)$. Hence, $y(S, \xi') < y(S', \xi')$, and thus, (S, P) is below (S', P') . By Lemma 6.7, (S, P) and (S', P') are sweep-adjacent, and Cor. 5.15 implies that (i) $\varpi(S', P') = 0$ and $\varpi(S, P) = 1$, or (ii) $\varpi(S', P') = \varpi(S, P) = 1$ and $\text{area}(P) < \text{area}(P')$, or (iii) $\varpi(S', P') = \varpi(S, P) = 0$ and $\text{area}(P) > \text{area}(P')$. Next, assume that we have $y(S, \xi') = y(S', \xi')$ for all $\xi' \in I[S] \cap I[S']$. Then, in particular, we have $y(S, \xi) = y(S', \xi)$ and $\Delta(S, \xi) = \Delta(S', \xi)$. Hence, by definition of \leq_{ξ} , the same three cases (i), (ii), and (iii) must hold according to Def. 6.1(3a,3b,3c). In summary, if $(S', P'), (S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ are \leq_{ξ} -adjacent and $P \neq P'$, then one of the three alternatives (i), (ii), and (iii) holds.

Case (i), together with Lemma 5.10, implies $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') = \emptyset$. Moreover, Case (ii) and Case (iii), together with Cor. 5.11, implies $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P')$ and $\text{Int}(P') \subsetneq \text{Int}(P)$, respectively. Conversely, we can use contraposition and the fact that one of the cases (i), (ii), and (iii) needs to be satisfied. Assume that Case (i) is not satisfied. Hence, Case (ii) or Case (iii) must hold and, as shown above, $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P')$ or $\text{Int}(P') \subsetneq \text{Int}(P)$ and thus, $\text{Int}(P') \cap \text{Int}(P) \neq \emptyset$. Thus, Statement (1) is satisfied. By similar arguments one shows that Statements (2) and (3) are satisfied. ■

Corollary 6.9. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and assume that $(S', P'), (S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ are \prec_{ξ} -adjacent where $P \neq P'$. If $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$, then the following three statements are satisfied.*

1. $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P')$ if and only if $\varpi(S', P') = 1$.
2. $\text{Int}(P') \subsetneq \text{Int}(P)$ if and only if $\varpi(S, P) = 0$.
3. $\text{Int}(P') \not\subsetneq \text{Int}(P)$ if and only if $\varpi(S, P) = 1$.

Proof. Note that $\varpi(S', P') = 1$ precisely in Case (2) of Prop. 6.8, and $\varpi(S, P) = 0$ precisely in Case (3) of Prop. 6.8 which establishes Statements (1) and (2) in this corollary, respectively. Moreover, negation of Statement (2), together with $P \neq P'$, implies Statement (3). \blacksquare

7. From Ordered Maximal Outstretched Segments to the Nesting Forest

We start with some simple properties of the nesting forest $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P})$. For fixed ξ , set $\mathcal{P}_{|\xi} := \{P \in \mathcal{P} \mid \xi \in I[P]\}$ and denote by $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$ the nesting forest of this subset of polygons.

Lemma 7.1. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, $P, P' \in \mathcal{P}$, and $(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$. If $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P')$, then there is a $(S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ with $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons, and let $P, P' \in \mathcal{P}$. Moreover, let $(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ and $\xi \in I[S]$. Suppose that $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P')$ and, therefore, $P \neq P'$. Assume, for contradiction, that $(S, P) \prec_{\xi} (S', P')$ for all $(S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$. First, if there is no such $(S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$, then $\xi \in I[P] \setminus I[P']$. Hence, $I[P] \not\subseteq I[P']$ implies by Obs. 5.1 that $\text{Int}(P) \not\subseteq \text{Int}(P')$; a contradiction. Now, assume that there is a $(S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$, and suppose that (S', P') is \prec_{ξ} -minimal w.r.t. P' . Then, by Cor. 6.5, $\varpi(S', P') = 1$, and by assumption $(S, P) \prec_{\xi} (S', P')$. The latter implies that there is a \prec_{ξ} -maximal $(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ w.r.t. P such that $(S, P) \prec_{\xi} (S', P')$. Hence, by the choice of (S, P) and (S', P') , we conclude that they are \prec_{ξ} -adjacent. Since $(S, P) \prec_{\xi} (S', P')$, the roles of P and P' in Cor. 6.9 are switched, and we can use Cor. 6.9 (3) and $\varpi(S', P') = 1$ to infer $\text{Int}(P) \not\subseteq \text{Int}(P')$; a contradiction. Hence, there must be a $(S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ with $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$. \blacksquare

Lemma 7.2. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and let $(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$. If (S, P) is the \prec_{ξ} -minimal element, then P is a root vertex in the nesting forest $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and let $(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ be the \prec_{ξ} -minimal element. Using contraposition, we assume that P is *not* a root vertex in the nesting forest $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$; i.e., there is a $P' \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P')$. Then, Lemma 7.1 implies that (S, P) cannot be the \prec_{ξ} -minimal element of $(\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$. \blacksquare

Remark 7.3. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygon and $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$. Then, (S', P') is the \prec_{ξ} -predecessor of (S, P) if $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$ and there is no $(S'', P'') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ with $(S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S'', P'') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$. Since \prec_{ξ} is a strict total order on $(\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$, the \prec_{ξ} -predecessor is always well-defined.

For instance, in Fig. 4, we have the following: (S_9, P_3) is the \prec_{ξ_2} -predecessor of (S_8, P_4) , (S_{11}, P_3) is the \prec_{ξ_3} -predecessor of (S_8, P_4) , (S_4, P_3) is the \prec_{ξ_1} -predecessor of (S_3, P_2) (S_8, P_5) is the \prec_{ξ_2} -predecessor of (S_7, P_5) . Furthermore, there is no \prec_{ξ_i} -predecessor of (S_{12}, P_3) for $i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$. The first two cases demonstrate that the \prec_{ξ} -predecessor of a given segments is not independent by the choice of ξ . Below, we will make use of the following observation regarding \prec_{ξ} -predecessor:

Lemma 7.4. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$, and let (S', P') be the \prec_{ξ} -predecessor of (S, P) , and $P \neq P'$. Then, for every $P'' \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{P, P'\}$, we have $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P'')$ if and only if $\text{Int}(P') \subsetneq \text{Int}(P'')$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$, and let (S', P') be the \prec_{ξ} -predecessor of (S, P) , and $P \neq P'$. Moreover, let $P'' \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{P, P'\}$.

First, assume that $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P'')$. Hence, Lemma 7.1 implies that there is a $(S'', P'') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ with $(S'', P'') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$. In particular, we can assume w.l.o.g. that (S'', P'') is \prec_{ξ} -maximal such that $(S'', P'') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$. By Remark 7.3 and since (S', P') is the \prec_{ξ} -predecessor of (S, P) , we have $(S'', P'') \prec_{\xi} (S', P') \prec_{\xi} (S, P)$. The latter arguments also imply that there is no pair $(*, P'')$ with $(S'', P'') \prec_{\xi} (*, P'') \prec_{\xi} (S', P')$. Let M be the set of all pairs $(*, P')$ with $(*, P') = (S', P')$ or $(S'', P'') \prec_{\xi} (*, P') \prec_{\xi} (S', P')$. Note $M \neq \emptyset$ and, by Remark 7.3, there is a \prec_{ξ} -minimal element (\tilde{S}', P') in M .

Taken the latter arguments together, (S'', P'') and (\widetilde{S}', P') are \leq_{ξ} -adjacent. Recall that $(S'', P'') \leq_{\xi} (S', P') \leq_{\xi} (S, P)$. Hence, by similar arguments, we can choose (\widetilde{S}, P) as the \leq_{ξ} -minimal pair among all pairs $(*, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ for which $(*, P) = (S, P)$ or $(S'', P'') \leq_{\xi} (*, P) \leq_{\xi} (S, P)$. Again, (S'', P'') and (\widetilde{S}, P) are \leq_{ξ} -adjacent with $(S'', P'') \leq_{\xi} (\widetilde{S}, P)$. This, together with Cor. 6.9 (1) and $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P'')$, implies $\varpi(S'', P'') = 1$. Since (S'', P'') and (\widetilde{S}', P') are \leq_{ξ} -adjacent with $(S'', P'') \leq_{\xi} (\widetilde{S}', P')$, Cor. 6.9 (1) and $\varpi(S'', P'') = 1$ imply that $\text{Int}(P') \subsetneq \text{Int}(P'')$.

Conversely, assume that $\text{Int}(P') \subsetneq \text{Int}(P'')$. By similar arguments as used in the previous case, there is a \leq_{ξ} -maximal (w.r.t. P'') element $(S'', P'') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ such that $(S'', P'') \leq_{\xi} (S', P') \leq_{\xi} (S, P)$. Now, we choose (\widetilde{S}, P) (resp., (\widetilde{S}', P')) as the \leq_{ξ} -minimal pair among all pairs $(*, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ (resp., $(*, P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$) that satisfy $(S'', P'') \leq_{\xi} (\widetilde{S}, P)$ (resp., $(S'', P'') \leq_{\xi} (\widetilde{S}', P')$). Analogously, and by interchanging the roles of P and P' , one shows that $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P'')$. ■

Now, we translate Prop. 6.8 to the relative location of the polygons in the nesting forest $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$.

Lemma 7.5. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$. If (S', P') is the \leq_{ξ} -predecessor of (S, P) and $P \neq P'$, then we have the following:*

1. P and P' are siblings in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$ if and only if $\varpi(S', P') = 0$ and $\varpi(S, P) = 1$.
2. P is a child of P' in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$ if and only if $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P') = 1$
3. P' is a child of P in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$ if and only if $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P') = 0$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$. Moreover, suppose the \leq_{ξ} -predecessor of (S, P) is (S', P') and $P \neq P'$. In particular, (S', P') and (S, P) are \leq_{ξ} -adjacent. By Prop. 6.8, precisely one the cases holds: (i) $\varpi(S', P') = 0$ and $\varpi(S, P) = 1$, or (ii) $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P') = 1$, or (iii) $\varpi(S, P) = \varpi(S', P') = 0$. Hence, we consider first the *if* directions for all Statements (1) to (3).

In Case (i), Prop. 6.8 (1) implies that $\text{Int}(P) \cap \text{Int}(P') = \emptyset$. Thus, neither $P \leq_{\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})} P'$ nor $P' \leq_{\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})} P$ can hold. Now, assume for contradiction that P and P' are *not* siblings in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$; i.e., P and P' are neither both roots nor have a common parent in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$. Hence, we may assume w.l.o.g. that P is not a root in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$. Thus, there is a $P'' \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{P, P'\}$ that is the parent of P in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$. In particular, $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P'')$. This, together with Lemma 7.4, implies $\text{Int}(P') \subsetneq \text{Int}(P'')$. Since by assumption, P'' cannot be the parent of P' in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$, we have a $P''' \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{P, P'\}$ such that $\text{Int}(P') \subsetneq \text{Int}(P''') \subsetneq \text{Int}(P'')$. Hence, Lemma 7.4 implies $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P''') \subsetneq \text{Int}(P'')$; a contradiction to the assumption that P'' is the parent of P in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$. Therefore, P and P' are siblings in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$.

In Case (ii), Prop. 6.8 (2) implies that $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P')$. Now, assume for contradiction that P is *not* a child of P' in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$. Hence, there must be a $P'' \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{P, P'\}$ such that $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P'') \subsetneq \text{Int}(P')$. Hence, $\text{Int}(P) \subsetneq \text{Int}(P'')$ and $\text{Int}(P') \not\subseteq \text{Int}(P'')$, together with Lemma 7.4, yields a contradiction. Hence, P is a child of P' in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$.

In Case (iii), Prop. 6.8 (3) implies that $\text{Int}(P') \subsetneq \text{Int}(P)$. One can show analogously to Case (ii) that P' is a child of P in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$.

Conversely, we show the *only-if* directions for Statements (1) to (3) by contraposition, and apply the fact that one of the cases (i), (ii) and (iii) needs to be satisfied. Assume that Case (i) is not satisfied. Hence, Case (ii) or Case (iii) must hold and, as shown above, P is a child of P' in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$ or P' is a child of P in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$; and thus, P and P' cannot be siblings in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$. Thus, Statement (1) is satisfied. By similar arguments one shows that Statement (2) and (3) are satisfied. ■

Corollary 7.6. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons and let $(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ be \leq_{ξ} -minimal w.r.t. the polygon P . Then, exactly one the following three statements is true:*

1. (S, P) is \leq_{ξ} -minimal in $(\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ and P is a root in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$;
2. The \leq_{ξ} -predecessor (S', P') of (S, P) satisfies $\varpi(S', P') = 1$ and P is a child of P' ;
3. The \leq_{ξ} -predecessor (S', P') of (S, P) satisfies $\varpi(S', P') = 0$ and P is a sibling of P' .

Proof. In the first case, (S, P) has no \leq_{ξ} -predecessor in $(\mathcal{S}_{|\xi}, \mathcal{P})$, and Lemma 7.2 implies that P is a root in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_{|\xi})$. Otherwise, (S, P) has a unique \leq_{ξ} -predecessor (S', P') , which satisfies $P' \neq P$ since (S, P) is \leq_{ξ} -minimal w.r.t. P by assumption. In particular, Corollary 6.5 implies $\varpi(S, P) = 1$. Therefore, we conclude by Lemma 7.5 that P is as child of P' if $\varpi(S', P') = 1$ and P is a sibling if $\varpi(S', P') = 0$. Clearly, the three alternatives are mutually exclusive and cover all possible cases. ■

Corollary 7.6 can be used to construct the nesting forest $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_\xi)$ by means of a single traversal of $(\mathcal{S}_\xi, \mathcal{P})$ in \prec_ξ -order. A forest is uniquely determined by the map $\text{parent}: V \rightarrow V \cup \{\emptyset\}$ that marks each root $r \in V$ by $\text{parent}(r) = \emptyset$ and assigns to every other vertex v its parent.

Lemma 7.7. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons. The following procedure correctly determines the parent-function for all vertices P in $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_\xi)$:*

For all $(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_\xi, \mathcal{P})$ **from small to large w.r.t. \prec_ξ do**

If (S, P) **is \prec_ξ -minimal w.r.t. P then**

(a) If (S, P) **is \prec_ξ -minimal in $(\mathcal{S}_\xi, \mathcal{P})$ then** $\text{parent}(P) \leftarrow \emptyset$

(b) If the \prec_ξ -predecessor (S', P') of (S, P) in $(\mathcal{S}_\xi, \mathcal{P})$ satisfies $\varpi(S', P') = 1$, then $\text{parent}(P) \leftarrow P'$.

(c) If the \prec_ξ -predecessor (S', P') of (S, P) in $(\mathcal{S}_\xi, \mathcal{P})$ satisfies $\varpi(S', P') = 0$, then $\text{parent}(P) \leftarrow \text{parent}(P')$.

Proof. The unique \prec_ξ -minimal segment $(S_0, P_0) \in (\mathcal{S}_\xi, \mathcal{P})$ identifies a root ρ_0 of $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_\xi)$ by Cor. 7.6 (1), and thus $\text{parent}(\rho_0)$ is correctly set to \emptyset . Then, every other element of $(\mathcal{S}_\xi, \mathcal{P})$ has a unique predecessor; say (S', P') . If $\varpi(S', P') = 1$, then by Cor. 7.6 (2) we have $\text{parent}(P) = P'$, i.e., it is correctly assigned in Case (b).

Otherwise, $\varpi(S', P') = 0$ implies by Cor. 7.6 (3) that P is a sibling of P' , and thus $\text{parent}(P) = \text{parent}(P')$. Since we traverse $(\mathcal{S}_\xi, \mathcal{P})$ in \prec_ξ -order, the \prec_ξ -minimal pair (\tilde{S}', P') w.r.t. to P' has been processed before (S, P) . Since every sequence of sibling relationships starts either with the root P_0 or with a polygon P_1 for which $\text{parent}(P_1)$ is determined directly according to Case (b) it follows that $\text{parent}(P')$ is already known explicitly when (S, P) is processed. Therefore, $\text{parent}(P) \leftarrow \text{parent}(P')$ correctly assigns the information on the parent of P . A single traversal of $(\mathcal{S}_\xi, \mathcal{P})$ in \prec_ξ -order is therefore sufficient to determine $\text{parent}(P)$ for all $P \in \mathcal{P}_\xi$. ■

It remains to show that $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_\xi)$ can be extended to the complete forest $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P})$. The following result shows that this can be achieved by a set of “sweep-lines” ξ such that every polygon is met at least once by a sweep-line.

Proposition 7.8. *The nesting forest $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P})$ is computed correctly by applying the procedure outlined in Lemma 7.7 for a finite set of values $X \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ there is $\xi \in I[P] \cap X$. In particular, it suffices to choose $X := \{\min(I[P]) \mid P \in \mathcal{P}\}$.*

Proof. By Obs. 5.1, $\text{Int}(P) \subseteq \text{Int}(P')$ implies $I[P] \subseteq I[P']$. Thus, if $\xi \in I[P]$, then $\xi \in I[P']$ for all ancestors of P in $\text{parent}_{\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P})}(P)$, and thus $\text{parent}_{\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P})}(P) = \text{parent}_{\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P}_\xi)}(P)$ for all $\xi \in I[P]$. Since, by assumption, a sweep-line ξ is employed such that $\xi \in I[P]$ for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$, $\text{parent}(P)$ is correctly determined for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$. In particular, therefore, it suffices for each polygon P to consider only the “first appearance” of P , i.e., $\min(I[P])$. ■

Proposition 7.8 suggests to “sweep” along the x -axis. The consistence of the \prec_ξ -order for different values of ξ , Lemma 6.4, furthermore, indicates that it is not necessary to determine the \prec_ξ -order again for each ξ . Instead, the order \prec_ξ can be reused for the next position ξ' of the sweep-line. However, since $(\mathcal{S}_\xi, \mathcal{P})$ and $(\mathcal{S}_{\xi'}, \mathcal{P})$ differ, it will be necessary to update $(\mathcal{S}_\xi, \mathcal{P})$ by adding the the maximally outstretched segments (S, P) with $\xi < \min(S)_x \leq \xi'$ and by removing those with $\max(S)_x \leq \xi'$. Note that the removal is necessary since otherwise the $\prec_{\xi'}$ -predecessor cannot be computed correctly. Taken together, these observations imply that it suffices to consider as sweep-line positions exactly the x -coordinates of the terminal vertices of the maximal outstretched segments, i.e., the set $\{\xi \mid \xi = \min(S)_x \text{ or } \xi = \max(S)_x \text{ with } (S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})\}$ and to update $(\mathcal{S}_\xi, \mathcal{P})$ and \prec_ξ exactly at these positions by inserting (S, P) at $\xi = \min(S)_x$ and removing (S, P) at $\xi = \max(S)_x$. Recalling, for fixed ξ , insertion must follow the \prec_ξ order to ensure that the \prec_ξ predecessor function is evaluated correctly. This defines an order $<$ in which maximal outstretched segments have to be inserted:

Definition 7.9. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of polygons. Then, we define the *insertion order* $<$ on $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ by setting $(S, P) < (S', P')$ whenever

1. $\min(S)_x < \min(S')_x$, or
2. $\min(S)_x = \min(S')_x$ and $(S, P) \prec_{\min(S)_x} (S', P')$.

Since $\min(S)_x = \min(S')_x$ implies $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}_{\min(S)_x}, \mathcal{P})$ and \prec_ξ is a strict total order in $(\mathcal{S}_\xi, \mathcal{P})$, it is clear that $<$ is indeed a strict total order on $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$. Now, combining the considerations at the beginning of this section and the results above, we arrive at the algorithm summarized in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 NestingForest(\mathcal{P})

Input: Set \mathcal{P} of overlap-free polygons**Output:** Nesting forest $\mathcal{F}(P)$

```
1: for each  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  do
2:   compute maximal outstretched segments  $S$  of  $P$  and determine  $\varpi(S)$ 
3:   compute area( $P$ )
4:  $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \text{sort}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$  w.r.t. insertion order  $<$  ▷ insertion list
5:  $\text{first}(S, P) \leftarrow \text{true}$  whenever  $(S, P) \in \mathcal{L}$  is  $<$ -minimal w.r.t.  $P$ 
6:  $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \text{sort}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$  w.r.t. increasing values of  $\max(S)_x$  ▷ removal list
7:  $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{L} \leftarrow \text{merge}$   $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  w.r.t.  $\max(S)_x$  for  $(S, P) \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $\min(S')_x$  for  $(S', P') \in \mathcal{L}$ 
8:  $\text{BST} \leftarrow \emptyset$  ▷ initialize balanced search tree for  $<_{\xi}$ 
9: for each  $(S, P)$  in the order of  $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{L}$  do
10:   if  $(S, P)$  taken from  $\mathcal{R}$  then delete  $(S, P)$  from BST
11:   else insert  $(S, P)$  into BST and ▷  $(S, P)$  taken from  $\mathcal{L}$ 
12:     if  $\text{first}(S, P)$  then
13:       if  $(S, P)$  is  $<_{\xi}$ -minimum in BST then  $\text{parent}(P) \leftarrow \emptyset$  ▷ insert  $P$  into  $F$  as root of a subforest
14:       else find  $<_{\xi}$ -predecessor  $(S', P')$  of  $(S, P)$  in BST and ▷  $(S, P)$  has a  $<_{\xi}$  predecessor
15:         if  $\varpi(S', P') = 1$  then  $\text{parent}(P) \leftarrow P'$ 
16:         else  $\text{parent}(P) \leftarrow \text{parent}(P')$  ▷  $P$  and  $P'$  are siblings
17: return  $\mathcal{F}$  ▷ as defined by  $\text{parent}(\cdot)$ 
```

Theorem 7.10. *Algorithm 1 correctly computes the nesting forest of a set \mathcal{P} of overlap-free polygons.*

Proof. By definition of the insertion order $<$ and the ordered insertion lists \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{R} , all (S, P) with the same values $\min(S)_x = \xi$ are inserted consecutively into BST and all (S, P) with the same values $\max(S)_x = \xi$ are removed consecutively from BST. Moreover, for given ξ , removal happens before insertions. Therefore, BST correctly holds the order $<_{\xi}$ of $(\mathcal{S}_{\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ before and after processing ξ . The insertion order $<$ prescribes that, for given ξ , the $<_{\xi}$ -smaller elements $(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_{\xi}, \mathcal{P})$ are inserted first. Thus, in particular, every (S, P) is inserted after its $<_{\xi}$ -predecessor (S', P') , and thus the $<_{\xi}$ -predecessor is correctly determined in BST. Moreover, for every polygon P , the (S, P) the first segment to be processed is the one that has minimal value of $\min(S)_x$, and is $<_{\min(S)_x}$ -minimal. Since it is either $<_{\xi}$ -minimal (and thus the polygon P is the root of subforest of F) or the $<_{\xi}$ -predecessor (S', P') exists and belongs to a different polygon $P' \neq P$. In the latter case, Lemma 7.7 implies that P is either a child or a sibling P' , depending whether $\varpi(S', P') = 1$ and $\varpi(S', P') = 0$, which in turn implies $\text{parent}(P) = P'$ or $\text{parent}(P) = \text{parent}(P')$, respectively. Thus, Algorithm 1 correctly identifies the parent of every $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Since $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P})$ is uniquely determined by its vertex set and parent function, Algorithm 1, correctly computes the nesting forest $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P})$. ■

Note that the insertion order $<$ and the lists \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{R} of insertions and removal of (S, P) do not need to be represented explicitly. In practice, it suffices to determine the set $X := \bigcup_{(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})} \{\min(S)_x, \max(S)_x\}$ of sweep-line positions. For each $\xi \in X$, one first removes all (S, P) with $\max(S)_x = \xi$ from BST, then sorts the (S, P) with $\min(S)_x = \xi$ w.r.t. $<_{\xi}$ and proceeds to insert them in this order. Marking a polygon P as “seen” when it appears for the first time in $<$ -order can be used instead of precomputing $\text{first}(S, P)$. Therefore, it is possible to implement Algorithm 1 in a single pass of the sweep-line position ξ instead of precomputing the order $<$. However, this does not affect the asymptotic running time.

Now, let us turn to analyzing the running time of Algorithm 1. In the following, we write $m := |\mathcal{P}|$ for the number of polygons, $n := \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |V(P)|$ for the total number of vertices, and $N := |(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})|$ for the total number of maximal outstretched segments.

Lemma 7.11. *The total effort for computing area(P) for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$ is $\mathcal{O}(n)$.*

Proof. The area of a simple polygon can be computed efficiently using the “shoelace formula”, also known as “Gauß’s area formula” [11, p. 53] and “Surveyor’s formula” [15]. As shown in [3], the effort for a single polygon is $\mathcal{O}(|V(P)|)$, and thus the total effort is $\mathcal{O}(n)$. ■

Lemma 7.12. *For a set of polygons \mathcal{P} , the total effort for computing the set of maximal outstretched segments $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ and the parity function $\varpi(S, P)$ for all $(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ is $\mathcal{O}(n)$.*

Proof. Consider a polygon $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Starting at an arbitrary vertex $u \in V(P)$, set $S = \emptyset$ and traverse P in the order of an arbitrarily chosen edge e incident with u , and proceed as follows: If the x -coordinate decreases along u keep adding edges with non-increasing x -coordinates to S until the first edge with increasing x -coordinate is found. Otherwise, add edges with non-decreasing x -coordinates until the first edge with decreasing x -coordinate is encountered. Every time an edge with opposing directions along the x -coordinate is found, a new segment S' is started. The procedure stops after $|V(P)|$ edges and vertices, when the starting point is u encountered again. The first segment S and last segment S^* are possibly incomplete, in which case they are part of the same maximal outstretched segment. If S and S^* contain non-vertical edges with the same directions, we concatenate them at u . Clearly, this can be done with $\mathcal{O}(|V(P)|)$ effort. Otherwise, S and S^* correspond to separate maximal outstretched segments. In our construction, S may contain leading vertical edges, which can be removed in $\mathcal{O}(|V(P)|)$ time. Finally, all trailing vertical edges are removed from all segments, which obviously also can be done in $\mathcal{O}(|V(P)|)$ effort. Thus, the maximal outstretched segments of P can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(|V(P)|)$ time. Hence, the total effort for computing $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ is $\mathcal{O}(n)$.

While traversing P , we can also keep the information which segment contains a vertex with maximal y -coordinate. Note that such a vertex \hat{p} always exists and is contained in maximal outstretched segments S . If the segment $(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ with $\hat{p} \in V(S)$ is unique, then $(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}_{\hat{p}_x}, \mathcal{P})$ is minimal w.r.t. P , and thus, we conclude by Cor. 6.5 that $\varpi(S, P) = 1$. Otherwise, \hat{p} is a terminal vertex of two maximal outstretched segments S and S' with $\hat{p} \in V(S) \cap V(S')$. If $\hat{p} = \min(S) = \min(S')$ with incident edges $e \in S$ and $e' \in S'$ such that $\Delta(e) > \Delta(e')$, then $\varpi(S, P) = 1$ and $\varpi(S', P) = 0$. If $\hat{p} = \max(S) = \max(S')$ with incident edges $e \in S$ and $e' \in S'$ such that $\Delta(e) < \Delta(e')$, then $\varpi(S, P) = 1$ and $\varpi(S', P) = 0$. The effort for determining \hat{p} , storing a pointer to its incident segment(s), determining whether \hat{p} is a terminal vertex, and computing the slopes at each vertex is a constant-time overhead for each vertex during the traversal of P . The total effort for determining \hat{p} and the parity of the incident segments is therefore $\mathcal{O}(|V(P)|)$. Consecutive maximal outstretched segments are then given alternating parity (cf. Cor. 4.11), which clearly also requires only linear effort. Thus, the total effort for assigning the parity is $\mathcal{O}(n)$. ■

We store the maximal outstretched segments (S, P) explicitly as separate lists of their edges ordered with increasing x -coordinates $\min(e)_x$. These lists will be required to identify the appropriate edge $e \in E(S)$ for given ξ , i.e., the edge satisfying $\min(e)_x \leq \xi < \max(e)_x$ for $\xi \in I[S]$. Moreover, assuming that $\text{area}(P)$ is precomputed and can be looked up in constant time and $\Delta(S, \xi)$ can obviously be evaluated in constant time if the appropriate edge $e \in E(S)$ with $\xi \in I[e]$ is known, we observe that each of the conditions for \prec_ξ in Def. 6.1 can be checked in constant time:

Observation 7.13. After $\mathcal{O}(n)$ preprocessing effort, the effort to evaluate for $(S, P), (S', P') \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ with $I[S] \cap I[S'] \neq \emptyset$, whether $(S, P) \prec_\xi (S', P')$, $(S', P') \prec_\xi (S, P)$, or $(S, P) = (S', P')$ is $\mathcal{O}(1)$ for any $\xi \in I[S] \cap I[S']$ if the appropriate edges $e \in E(S)$ with $\xi \in I[e]$ and $e' \in E(S')$ with $\xi \in I[e']$ are known.

Lemma 7.14. *For a set \mathcal{P} of polygons, the set $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ can be sorted in “insertion order” \prec in $\mathcal{O}(N \log N)$ time.*

Proof. The minima $\min(S)$ and their x -coordinates can be determined in constant time for each maximal outstretched segment (S, P) . For all (S, P) and (S', P') a comparison w.r.t. \prec entails a comparison the $\min(S)_x$ and $\min(S')_x$, requires only constant time, and, in the case of equality, a comparison w.r.t. $\prec_{\min(S)_x}$, which can be performed in constant time by Observation 7.13. Since $|(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})| = N$, the set $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ can be sorted w.r.t. to \prec in $\mathcal{O}(N \log N)$ time using a standard sorting algorithm, e.g. heap sort. ■

A *self-balancing binary search trees* (BST) can be used to maintain the order on $(\mathcal{S}_{\xi}, \mathcal{P})$. Since $|(\mathcal{S}_{\xi}, \mathcal{P})| \leq N$, the BST guarantees search, insertion and deletion of entries in $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$ time, provided comparisons w.r.t. to the relevant total order can be performed in constant time, see e.g. [10, Sec. 6.2.3].

Theorem 7.15. *Algorithm 1 can be implemented to run in $\mathcal{O}(n + N \log N)$ time and $\mathcal{O}(n)$ space for any set \mathcal{P} of overlap-free polygons with $m = |\mathcal{P}|$, $n = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |V(P)|$ and $N = |(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})|$.*

Proof. The identification of all maximal outstretched segments $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$, the precomputation of the parity functions $\varpi(S, P)$ for all $(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$, in Line 2, can be performed in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time by Lemma 7.12. Moreover, computing the $\text{area}(P)$ for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$, in Line 3, can be performed in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time by Lemma 7.11. The insertion order \prec , in Line 4,

requires $\mathcal{O}(N \log N)$ time. In particular, setting the pointer “first” in Line 5, can be done in $\mathcal{O}(N) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(n)$. The x -coordinates of the maxima $\max(S)$, in Line 6, can also be sorted on $\mathcal{O}(N \log N)$ time. Interleaving the x -coordinates for insertions and deletions, in Line 7, requires $\mathcal{O}(N)$ steps, corresponding to a merging step of the insertion and deletion orders.

Next, we consider the total running-time of the BST-operations, i.e., insertions, deletions, and predecessor search, in Line 8, 10, 11 and 14. First, we note that each $(S, P) \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ is inserted and removed exactly once from the BST. In addition, the \prec_ξ -predecessor needs to be found once for each polygon. This amounts to $2N + m \in \mathcal{O}(N)$ BST-operations. The BST data structure guarantees that each operation can be performed in $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$ time *provided* the comparison function can be evaluated with constant effort. The evaluation of \prec_ξ in constant time is contingent on the availability of the “appropriate edge” e of (S, P) , i.e., the one that satisfies $\xi \in I[e]$, cf. Obs. 7.13. To this end, we associate a *current edge* $e_{(S,P)}$ with each (S, P) that is in BST. Recall that the maximal outstretched segments are traversed in order during preprocessing. Hence, an ordered list of their edges with increasing $\min(e)_x$ is obtain as part of the preprocessing in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ total time. We initialize $e_{(S,P)}$ with the edge $e \in E(S)$ that contains $\min(S)$. When accessing a vertex (S, P) in the BST, we check whether $e_{(S,P)}$ intersects ξ . This test can be performed in constant time. Since the number of BST-operations is in $\mathcal{O}(N)$ and, for each BST-operation, the number of accessed vertices is in $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$, the total number of accessed vertices in BST is in $\mathcal{O}(N \log N)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{O}(N \log N)$ tests for the intersection of ξ and $e_{(S,P)}$ are performed. If a test fails, we advance along the ordered edges of (S, P) until we reach the edge $e' \in E(S)$ with $\xi \in I[e']$, and update $e_{(S,P)} \leftarrow e'$. Since each edge of (S, P) is traversed at most once during the updates of $e_{(S,P)}$, the total effort is $\sum_{(S,P) \in (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})} |E(S)| \leq n$. Therefore, the effort for maintaining the current edges is in $\mathcal{O}(n + N \log N)$. Hence, performing the BST-operations in Line 8, 10, 11 and 14, together with maintaining the current edges, requires a total effort of $\mathcal{O}(n + N \log N)$. Each of the Lines 12, 13, 15 and 16 require only constant time for each (S, P) , and thus, the total effort for these operations is in $\mathcal{O}(N)$.

Taken together Algorithm 1 requires $\mathcal{O}(n)$ operations for preprocessing, $\mathcal{O}(N \log N)$ effort to construct the insertion order \prec , and $\mathcal{O}(n + N \log N)$ effort to maintain the current edges required to perform the $\mathcal{O}(N \log N)$ BST-operations with constant-time \prec_ξ comparisons. Therefore, the total running time is in $\mathcal{O}(n + N \log N)$.

Moreover, saving the necessary information of the polygons (i.e., their vertices, edges, area and “parent”) is in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ space. Likewise, saving the set $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$ of maximal outstretched segments, together with their vertices and edges, is in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ space. The BST and the sorted lists \mathcal{L} , \mathcal{R} and $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{L}$ of maximal outstretched segments are each in $\mathcal{O}(N) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(n)$ space. Hence, the total space required is in $\mathcal{O}(n)$. ■

Lemma 7.16. *The polygon nesting problem is in $\Omega(n + m \log m)$.*

Proof. Consider the special case that the nesting forest is a path, i.e, there are no siblings. Then, the nesting problem reduced to sorting the polygons by size. The sorting-problem of m elements w.r.t. to an order for which comparisons can be evaluated in constant time is in $\Omega(m \log m)$, see e.g. [1, Sec. 3.3] and [14, Sec. 2.1.6]. This, together with the fact that the nesting-problem is in $\Omega(n)$, implies the lower bound $\Omega(n + m \log m)$. ■

Theorem 7.15 and Lemma 7.16 together imply

Corollary 7.17. *For a set \mathcal{P} of overlap-free polygons with $m = |\mathcal{P}|$, $n = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |V(P)|$ and $N = |(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})|$, the worst-case time complexity of the nesting-problem is in $\Omega(n + m \log m)$ and $\mathcal{O}(n + N \log N)$.*

A polygon P is called *convex* whenever $\text{Int}(P)$ is a convex set. It is easy to verify that a convex polygon harbors exactly 2 maximal outstretched segments. Hence, Corollary 7.17 implies that our approach is asymptotically optimal in this case.

Corollary 7.18. *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of m overlap-free polygons. Suppose every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ is convex or $|V(P)| \leq K$ for some fixed constant K . Then, Algorithm 1 runs in $\mathcal{O}(n + m \log m)$. In particular, this is optimal.*

Proof. If P is convex, it contains exactly 2 maximally outstretched segments. Similarly, if $|V(P)| \leq K$ then there are $\mathcal{O}(1)$ maximally outstretched segments in each polygon, and thus $\mathcal{O}(N) = \mathcal{O}(m)$. Hence, the restricted polygon nesting problem can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(n + m \log m)$ time by Algorithm 1. The lower bound of Lemma 7.16 shows that the running time of Algorithm 1 is asymptotically optimal for this special case. ■

8. Summary and Outlook

We have described here a variant of *sweep line algorithm* that determines the nesting of polygons with non-intersecting interior, generalizing a similar algorithm by Bajaj and Dey [2] for non-touching polygons. The main innovation of our approach is the definition of *maximal outstretches segments* and a corresponding ordering of these segments along the sweep line that can be computed and maintained efficiently and consistently handles overlapping points and edges along these segments. This construction makes it possible to achieve a running time of $\mathcal{O}(n+N \log N)$, where $N < n$ is the number of maximal outstretched segments. The resulting algorithm is optimal e.g. for convex polygons. The algorithm of Bajaj and Dey [2] uses “subchains” that are parts of convex chains. These are subsets of the maximal outstretched segments introduced here. While this does not, in general, yield an asymptotic improvement, it reduced the number of segments that have to be considered.

In summary, we computed the nesting of touching polygons. However, we did not determine whether, and in the affirmative case, where exactly two polygons P, P' of \mathcal{P} are touching. Such points can of course be determined by the classical sweep line approach, and then can be added to data on the corners of \mathcal{P} . It is necessary, however, to order such touching points with different incident polygons along each of the edges of the polygon \mathcal{P} . We shall consider this problem in more detail in a forthcoming contribution.

A problem closely related to the nesting of polygons is to consider the nesting of their connected components. This amounts to considering the (connected components of) the the graph G obtained as the union of the vertices of edges of the polygons, is insufficient to completely specify the set of polygons. The 2-basis comprising of the facets of the planar embedding of G [13], in particular, results in decomposition of G into non-overlapping polygons such that all polygons are siblings. It is worth noting that a 2-basis of minimum total length can be computed in linear time [12]. Nested sets of polygons are obtained from a two-basis as hierarchy (w.r.t. to inclusion) restricted to sets of facets such that the sum of the facets in each set forms a simple cycle, i.e., a polygon. The connected components of G in the given embedding have (not necessarily simple) cycles as their inner and outer limits, which in contrast to the polygons considered here, may also contain degenerate points, i.e., the interior of these polygons is no longer connected. Nesting of connected components then can be understood in terms of these possibly generate polygons. We suspect that it is sufficient for connected component nesting to consider the 2-connected components of the outline-cycles, which would reduce the problem to the touching simple polygons considered here.

Acknowledgments

We thank David Schaller for stimulating discussions on this topic. This work was funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) (Proj. No. MI 439/14-2).

References

- [1] Aho, A.V., Hopcroft, J.E., 1974. The Design and Analysis of Computer Algorithms. 1st ed., Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., Reading, MA.
- [2] Bajaj, C.L., Dey, T.K., 1990. Polygon nesting and robustness. Information Processing Letters 35, 23–32. doi:10.1016/0020-0190(90)90169-X.
- [3] Braden, B., 1986. The Surveyors Area Formula. The College Mathematics Journal 17, 326–337. doi:10.1080/07468342.1986.11972974.
- [4] Choi, S.H., Kwok, K.T., 2004. A topological hierarchy-sorting algorithm for layered manufacturing. Rapid Prototyping Journal 10, 98–113. doi:10.1108/13552540410526971.
- [5] Diestel, R., 2010. Graph Theory. volume 173 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Fourth ed., Springer, Heidelberg; New York.
- [6] Fáry, I., 1948. On straight-line representation of planar graphs. Acta Sci. Math. 11, 229–233.
- [7] Huang, C.W., Shih, T.Y., 1997. On the complexity of point-in-polygon algorithms. Computers & Geosciences 23, 109–118. doi:10.1016/S0098-3004(96)00071-4.
- [8] Johnstone, J.K., 2017. On the nesting of a contour dataset and its use in repair. Computer-Aided Design and Applications 14, 796–804. doi:10.1080/16864360.2017.1287755.
- [9] Kirby, G.H., Visvalingam, M., Wade, P., 1989. Recognition and representation of a hierarchy of polygons with holes. Computer J. 32, 554–562. doi:10.1093/comjnl/32.6.554.
- [10] Knuth, D.E., 1998. The Art of Computer Programming – Volume 3: Sorting and Searching. Addison-Wesley Professional, Boston.
- [11] Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen (Ed.), 1929. Carl Friedrich Gauss Werke: Varia. volume 12. Julius Springer in Berlin. URL: <http://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?PPN236060120>.
- [12] Liebchen, C., Rizzi, R., 2007. Classes of cycle bases. Discrete Appl. Math. 155, 337–355. doi:10.1016/j.dam.2006.06.007.
- [13] Mac Lane, S., 1937. A combinatorial condition for planar graphs. Fundamenta Mathematicae 28, 22–32. doi:10.4064/fm-28-1-22-32.

- [14] Mehlhorn, K., 1984. Data Structures and Algorithms 1. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-69672-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-69672-5).
- [15] Meister, A.L.F., 1769. Generalia de genesi figurarum planarum et inde pendentibus earum affectionibus, in: *Novi Commentarii Societatis Regiae Scientiarum Gottingensis*, Vol. 1. Dietrich, Göttingen, pp. 144–180. URL: <https://opacplus.bsb-muenchen.de/title/BV001618613>.
- [16] Seemann, C.R., Moulton, V., Stadler, P.F., Hellmuth, M., 2023. Planar median graphs and cubesquare-graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 331, 38–58. doi:[10.1016/j.dam.2023.01.022](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2023.01.022).
- [17] Semple, C., Steel, M., 2003. *Phylogenetics*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- [18] Shimrat, M., 1962. Algorithm 112: Position of point relative to polygon. *Communications of the ACM* 5, 434. doi:[10.1145/368637.368653](https://doi.org/10.1145/368637.368653).
- [19] Zhu, C., 1994. *Topology Building and Random Polygon Generation*. Master's thesis. University of British Columbia.