

Fatness of Simple Polygons

Sharmila Duppala

David Kraemer

April 2018

1 Problem Statement

Professor Mitchell’s description. Computing the Niceness of a Polygonal Shape. There are various notions of quantifying how “nice” or how “fat” a simple polygon P is. A “nicest” polygon might be a regular n -gon, which most closely approximates a circular disk. This project seeks to implement some precise metrics for niceness, and compare them on simple polygons (possibly moused in by a user or read in from a file, etc). To make it simple and discrete, I propose that you discretize the boundary of P with discrete points p_i (additional vertices), with a prescribed spacing, δ . (That is, for edges of P longer than δ , add vertices along the edge so that the new sub-segments are of length at most δ , for a user-specified parameter δ .)

Then, consider discrete choices of radii $r = \rho, 2\rho, 3\rho, \dots$ for disks, $B(p_i, r)$, centered at the discrete boundary points p_i , for each radius r . The (discrete) fatness of P is given by the smallest value of the ratio $\lambda(B(p_i, r) \cap P) / \lambda(B(p_i, r))$, over all choices of p_i and $r = \rho, 2\rho, 3\rho, \dots$ such that P is not contained fully inside $B(p_i, r)$.

Implement and experiment with this fatness measure. It may be possible to use the algorithm to assist a project at Harvard on Gerrymandering, where the goal is to quantify how “compact” polygonal election districts are. (So I hope that at least a couple of people choose to do this project! We can discuss further.)

(Theoretically, we are interested in finding an algorithm to compute the “exact” fatness of P (which allows disks centered anywhere inside P , of any radius such that the disk does not contain all of P), without resorting to the simple discretization. Or, can we compute a provable approximation to the exact fatness?)

2 Definitions

Our present objective is to develop rigorous measures of the “niceness” of simple bounded closed planar polygons with the intuitive hierarchy that regular n -gons are “nicest” followed by convex n -gons and proceeded by “fat” polygons—i.e., polygons which retain their structure under smoothing filters.

Throughout we assume that $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ is a simple bounded closed polygon. We shall denote by ∂P the boundary of P , with $|\partial P|$ denoting the perimeter and $\lambda(P)$ denoting the area. For given points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, denote the closed line segment bounded by x and y by $[x, y]$. The class of such polygons is denoted by \mathcal{P} .

One class of “fatness” measures arises through partitioning P into two (interior disjoint) polygons $P = P' \cup P''$ via chords. A chord is a pair $x, y \in \partial P$ such that the segment $[x, y]$ is contained by the relative interior of P except at the endpoints x and y . Such a chord $[x, y]$ defines a partition of $P = P' \cup P''$ by orientation, so that $\partial P'$ is the arc from x to y with $[y, x]$ and that $\partial P''$ is the arc from y to x with $[x, y]$.

Definition 2.1. Let $f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For a given $P \in \mathcal{P}$, its *chord- f score* is given by

$$s_f(P) = \inf_{x, y \in \partial P} \max(f(P'), f(P''))$$

where the chord $[x, y]$ partitions $P = P' \cup P''$.

Intuitively, f represents a polygon’s cost with respect to a certain measurement. For example, if f indicates the perimeter of P , then s_f is associated with a partition of P such that the maximum perimeter of either subpolygon is minimized. Indeed, measures such as perimeter or area are the typical choices of f , but any suitable property of the polygon may be employed.

The visibility kernel of P , denoted by $\ker P$, is the subset of P which “sees” all of P . That is, if $x \in \ker P$ and $y \in P$, then $[x, y] \subseteq P$. Another proposed measure of polygonal “niceness” utilizes the visibility kernel.

Definition 2.2. The *visibility kernel score* is given by

$$s_{\text{vis}}(P) = \frac{\lambda(\ker P)}{\lambda(P)}.$$

If P is a regular n -gon or convex $s_{\text{vis}}(P) = 1$, since trivially $\ker P = P$. On the other hand, if P is not star shaped, then $s_{\text{vis}}(P) = 0$.

Equipped with an L_p norm ($p \in [1, \infty]$), denote by $B(x, \rho)$ the closed ball of radius $\rho > 0$ centered at $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. The natural choice is simply the Euclidean norm, but L_∞ provides a setting for which computing $B(x, \rho) \cap P$ resolves to polygonal intersection. By topological equivalence, we lose no specificity. A final measure of “fatness” measures local nonconvexities of P and identifies the most offending ratio.

Definition 2.3. The α -*fatness score* is given by

$$\alpha(P) = \inf \left\{ \frac{\lambda(B(x, \rho) \cap P)}{\lambda(B(x, \rho))} : x \in \partial P, \rho > 0, P \not\subseteq B(x, \rho) \right\}$$

For a given $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$, let $\mathcal{C}(x, S)$ denote the connected component of S containing x . An alternative formulation of α -fatness replaces $B(x, \rho) \cap P$ with its connected component: $\mathcal{C}(x, B(x, \rho) \cap P)$. In principle, $\alpha(P)$ is computed by sweeping continuously, but for simplicity we can merely discretize ∂P with a parameter $\delta > 0$ indicating the maximal distance between points in ∂P .

3 Implementation

We plan to implement these measures of polygonal “fatness” and compare them for assorted collections of polygons, from theoretical and randomly-generated examples to historical electoral map data. We hope to determine the relative strengths of these measures as heuristics for polygonal “fatness” individually or in an ensemble on this data.