University of Warsaw
Faculty of Mathematics, Informatics and Mechanics

Katarzyna Kowalska
Student no. 371053

Approximation and Parametrized Algorithms for Segment Set Cover

Master's thesis
in COMPUTER SCIENCE

Supervisor:
dr Michał Pilipczuk
Instytut Informatyki

June 2020

Supervisor's statement

Hereby I confirm that the presented thesis was prepared under my supervision and that it fulfils the requirements for the degree of Master of Computer Science.

Date Supervisor's signature

Author's statement

Hereby I declare that the presented thesis was prepared by me and none of its contents was obtained by means that are against the law.

The thesis has never before been a subject of any procedure of obtaining an academic degree.

Moreover, I declare that the present version of the thesis is identical to the attached electronic version.

Date Author's signature

Abstract

The work presents a study of different geometric set cover problems. It mostly focuses on segment set cover and its connection to the polygon set cover.

Keywords

set cover, geometric set cover, FPT, W[1]-completeness, APX-completeness, PCP theorem, NP-completeness

Thesis domain (Socrates-Erasmus subject area codes)

11.3 Informatyka

Subject classification

D. Software
D.127. Blabalgorithms
D.127.6. Numerical blabalysis

Tytuł pracy w języku polskim

Algorytmy parametryzowania i trudność aproksymacji problemu pokrywania zbiorów odcinkami na płaszczyźnie

Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

The Set Cover problem is one of the most common NP-complete problems. [tutaj referencja] We are given a family of sets and have to choose the smallest subfamily of these sets that cover all their elements. This problem naturally extends to settings were we put different weights on the sets and look for the subfamily of the minimal weight. This problem is NP-complete even without weights and if we put restrictions on what the sets can be. One of such variants is Vertex Cover problem, where sets have size 2 (they are edges in a graph).

In this work we focus on another such variant where the sets correspond to some geometric shapes and only some points of the plane have to be covered. When these shapes are rectangles with edges parallel to the axis, the problem can be proven to be W[1]-complete (solution of size k cannot be found in $n^{o}(k)$ time), APX-complete (for suffciently small $\epsilon > 0$, the problem does not admit $1 + \epsilon$-approximation scheme) [refrencje].

Some of these settings are very easy. Set cover with lines parallel to one of the axis can be solved in polynomial time.

There is a notion of δ-expansions, which loosen the restrictions on geometric set cover. We allow the objects to cover the points after δ-expansion and compare the result to the original setting. This way we can produce both FPT and EPTAS for the rectangle set cover with δ-extensions [referencje].

Our contribution. In this work, we prove that unweighted geometric set cover with segments is fixed parameter tractable (FPT).

Moreover, we show that geometric set cover with segments is APX-complete for unweighted axis-parallel segments, even with 1/2-extensions. So the problem for very thin rectangles also can't admit PTAS. Therefore, in the efficient polynomial-time approximation scheme (EPTAS) for *fat polygons* by [Har-Peled and Lee, 2009], the assumption about polygons being fat is necessary.

Finally, we show that geometric set cover with weighted segments in 3 directions is W[1]-complete. However, geometric set cover with weighted segments is FPT if we allow δ-extension.

This result is especially interesting, since it's counter-intuitive that the unweighed setting is FPT and the weighted setting is W[1]-complete. Most of such problems (like vertex cover or [wiecej przykladow]) are equally hard in both weighted and unweighted settings.

Chapter 2

Definitions

2.1. Geometric Set Cover

In the geometric set cover problem we are are given $\mathcal{P}$ – a set of objects, which are connected subsets of the plane, $\mathcal{C}$ – a set of points in the plane. The task is to choose $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ such that every point in $\mathcal{C}$ is inside some element from $\mathcal{R}$ and $|\mathcal{R}|$ is minimized.

In the parametrized setting for a given k, we only look for a solution $\mathcal{R}$ such that $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$.

In the weighted setting, there is some given weight function $f : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^+$, and we would like to find a solution $\mathcal{R}$ that minimizes $\sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} f(R)$.

2.2. Approximation

Let us recall some definitions related to optimization problems that are used in the following sections.

Definition 1. A **polynomial-time approximation scheme (PTAS)** for a minimization problem Π is a family of algorithms $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ for every $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ takes an instance I of Π and in polynomial time finds a solution that is within a factor $(1 + \epsilon)$ of being optimal. That means the reported solution has weight at most $(1 + \epsilon)opt(I)$, where $opt(I)$ is the weight of an optimal solution for I.

Definition 2. A problem Π is **APX-hard** if assuming P $\neq$ NP, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that there is no polynomial-time $(1 + \epsilon)$-approximation algorithm for Π.

2.3. δ-extensions

TODO PLACEHOLDER for introductory text

δ-extensions is one of the modifications to a problem, that makes geometric set cover problem easier, it has been already used in literature (place some refrence here).

Definition 3 (δ-extensions for center-symmetric objects)**.** For any $\delta > 0$ and a center-symmetric object L with centre of symmetry $S = (x_s, y_s)$, the **δ-extension** of L is the object $L^{+\delta} = \{(1 + \delta) \cdot (x - x_s, y - y_s) + (x_s, y_s) : (x, y) \in L\}$, that is, $L^{+\delta}$ is the image of L under homothety centered at S with scale $(1 + \delta)$

The geometric set cover problem with δ-extensions is a modified version of geometric set cover where:

- We need to cover all the points in $\mathcal{C}$ with objects from $\{P^{+\delta} : P \in \mathcal{P}\}$ (which always include no fewer points than the objects before δ-extensions);

- We look for a solution that is no larger than the optimum solution for the original problem. Note that it does not need to be an optimal solution in the modified problem.

Formally, we have the following.

Definition 4 (Geometric set cover problem with δ-extensions)**.** The geometric set cover problem with δ-extensions is the problem where for an input instance $I = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C})$, the task is to output a solution $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ such that the δ-extended set $\{R^{+\delta} : R \in \mathcal{R}\}$ covers $\mathcal{C}$ and is no larger than the optimal solution for the problem without extensions, i.e. $|\mathcal{R}| \leq |opt(I)|$.

TODO: Some text

Definition 5 (Geometric set cover PTAS with δ-extensions)**.** We define a PTAS for geometric set cover with δ-extensions as a family of algorithms $\{\mathcal{A}_{\delta,\epsilon}\}_{\delta,\epsilon>0}$ that each takes as an input instance $I = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C})$, and in polynomial-time outputs a solution $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ such that the δ-extended set $\{R^{+\delta} : R \in \mathcal{R}\}$ covers $\mathcal{C}$ and is within a $(1+\epsilon)$ factor of the optimal solution for this problem without extensions, i.e. $(1+\epsilon)|\mathcal{R}| \leq |opt(I)|$.

Chapter 3

Geometric Set Cover with segments

3.1. FPT for segments

In this section we consider the fixed-parameter tractable algorithms for unweighted geometric set cover with segments. Setting where segments are limited to be axis-parallel (or limited to constant number of directions) has an FPT algorithm already present in literature. We present an FPT algorithm for unweighted geometric set cover with segments, where segments are in arbitrary directions.

3.1.1. Axis-parallel segments

You can find this in Platypus book. (TODO add referece)

We show an $\mathcal{O}(2^k)$-time branching algorithm. In each step, the algorithm selects a point a which is not yet covered, branches to choose one of the two directions, and greedily chooses a segment in that direction to cover a. This proceeds until either all points are covered or k segments are chosen.

Let us take the point $a = (x_a, y_a)$ which is the smallest among points that are not yet covered in the lexicographic ordering of points in $\mathbb{R}^2$. We need to cover a with some of the remaining segments.

Branch over the choice of one of the coordinates (x or y); without loss of generality, let us assume we chose x. Among the segments lying on line $x = x_a$, we greedily add to the solution the one that covers the most points. As a was the smallest in the lexicographical order, then all points on line $x = x_a$ have the y-coordinate larger than y_a. Therefore, if we denote the greedily chosen segment as s, then any other segment on $x = x_a$ that covers a can only cover a (possibly improper) subset of points covered by s. Thus, greedily choosing s is optimal.

In each step of the algorithm we add one segment to the solution, thus each branch can stop at depth k. If no branch finds a solution, then that means a solution of size at most k does not exist.

TODO: Maybe split it into theorem + algorithm + explanation like in section 3.1.2

Remark 1. *The same algorithm can be used for segments in d directions, where we branch over d directions and it runs in complexity $\mathcal{O}(d^k)$.*

3.1.2. Segments in arbitrary directions

In this section we consider setting where segments are not constrained to only d directions. We present a fixed-parameter tractable algorithm, where parameter is the size of the solution.

Theorem 1. ***(FPT for segment cover).*** *There exists an algorithm that given a family $\mathcal{P}$ of n segments (in any direction), a set of m points $\mathcal{C}$ and a parameter k, runs in time $k^{O(k)} \cdot (nm)^2$, and outputs a subfamily $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ such that $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$ and $\mathcal{R}$ covers all points in $\mathcal{C}$, or determines that such a set $\mathcal{R}$ does not exist.*

We will need the following lemmas.

Lemma 1. *Given an instance $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C})$ of the segment cover problem, without a loss of generality we can assume that no segment covers a superset of what another segment covers. That is, for any distinct $A, B \in \mathcal{P}$, we have $A \cap C \nsubseteq B \cap C$ and $A \cap C \nsupseteq B \cap C$.*

Proof. Trivial. ☐

Lemma 2. *Given an instance $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C})$ of the segment cover problem, if there exists a line L with at least $k+1$ points on it, then there exists a subset $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$, $|\mathcal{A}| \leq k$, such that every solution $\mathcal{R}$ with $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$ satisfies $|\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{R}| \geq 1$. Moreover, such a subset can be found in polunomial time.*

Proof. First we use Lemma 1.

Let us enumerate the points from $\mathcal{C}$ that lie on L as $x_1, x_2, \ldots x_t$ in the order in which they appear on L. Every segment that is not collinear with L can cover at most one of these points. Therefore, in any solution of size not larger than k, among any k of these points at least one must be covered with segment collinear with L.

Therefore, every solution needs to take one of the segments collinear with L that covers any of the points $x_1, x_2, \ldots x_k$. After using reduction from Lemma 1, there are at most k such segments that are distinct. ☐

We are ready to prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1.

We will prove this theorem by presenting a branching algorithm that works in desired complexity. It branches over the choice of segments to cover lines with *a lot* of points, then finally solving the small instance, where every line has at most k points by checking all possible solutions.

Algorithm. First we use Lemma 1.

Next, we present a recursive algorithm. Given an instance of the problem:

(1) If there exist a line with at least $k+1$ points from $\mathcal{C}$, we branch over adding to the solution one of the at most k possible segments provided by Lemma 2; name this segment S. Then we find a solution $\mathcal{R}$ for the problem for points $\mathcal{C} - S$, segments $\mathcal{P} - \{S\}$, and parameter $k-1$. We return $\mathcal{R} \cup \{S\}$.

(2) If every line has at most k points on it and $|\mathcal{C}| > k^2$, then answer `NO`.

(3) If $|\mathcal{C}| \leq k^2$, solve the problem by brute force: check all subsets of $\mathcal{P}$ of size at most k.

Correctness. Lemma 2 proves that at least one segment that we branch over in (1) must be present in every solution $\mathcal{R}$ with $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$. Therefore, the recursive call can find a solution, provided there exists one.

In (2) the answer is no, because every line covers no more than k points from $\mathcal{C}$, which implies the same about every segment from $\mathcal{P}$. Under this assumption we can cover only k^2 points with a solution of size k, which is less than $|\mathcal{C}|$.

Checking all possible solutions in (3) is trivially correct.

Complexity. In the leaves of recursion we have $|\mathcal{C}| \leq k^2$, so $|\mathcal{P}| \leq k^4$, because every segments can be uniquely identified by the two extreme points it covers (by Lemma 1). Therefore, there are $\binom{k^4}{k}$ possible solutions to check, each can be checked in time $O(k|\mathcal{C}|)$. Therefore, (3) takes time $k^{O(k)}$.

In this branching algorithm our parameter k is decreased with every recursive call, so we have at most k levels of recursion with branching over k possibilites. Candidates to branch over can be found on each level in time $O((nm)^2)$.

Reduction from Lemma 1 can be implemented in time $O(n^2m)$.

It follows that the overall complexity is $O((nm)^2 \cdot k^O(k))$ $\square$

3.2. APX-completeness for segments parallel to axes

In this section we analyze whether there exists PTAS for geometric set cover for rectangles. We show that we can restrict this problem to a very simple setting: segments parallel to axes and allow (1/2)-extension, and the problem is still APX-hard. Note that segments are just degenerated rectangles with one side being very narrow.

Our results can be summarized in the following theorem and this section aims to prove it.

Theorem 2. ***(axis-parallel segment set cover with 1/2-extension is APX-hard).*** *Unweighted geometric set cover with axis-parallel segments in 2D (even with 1/2-extension) is APX-hard. That is, assuming $P \neq NP$, there does not exist a PTAS for this problem.*

Theorem 2 implies the following.

Corollary 1. ***(rectangle set cover is APX-hard).*** *Unweighted geometric set cover with rectangles (even with 1/2-extension) is APX-hard.*

We prove Theorem 2 by taking a problem that is APX-hard and showing a reduction. For this problem we choose MAX-(3,3)-SAT which we define below.

3.2.1. MAX-(3,3)-SAT and statement of reduction

Definition 6. MAX-3SAT is the following maximization problem. We are given a 3-CNF formula, and need to find an assignment of variables that satisfies the most clauses.

Definition 7. MAX-(3,3)-SAT is a variant of MAX-3SAT with an additional restriction that every variable appears in exactly 3 clauses. Note that thus, the number of clauses is equal to the number of variables.

In our proof of Theorem 2 we use hardness of approximation of MAX-(3,3)-SAT proved in [Håstad, 2001] and described in Theorem 3 below.

Definition 8 (α-satisfiable MAX-3SAT formula)**.** MAX-3SAT formula of size n is at most α-satisfiable, if every assignment of variables satisfies no more than αn clauses.

Theorem 3. ***[Håstad, 2001]***

For any $\epsilon > 0$, it is NP-hard to distinguish satisfiable (3,3)-SAT formulas from at most $(7/8 + \epsilon)$-satisfiable (3,3)-SAT formulas.

Given an instance I of MAX-(3,3)-SAT, we construct an instance J of axis-parallel segment set cover problem, such that for a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, a polynomial time $(1+\epsilon)$-approximation algorithm for J would be able to distinguish whether an instance I of MAX-(3,3)-SAT is fully satisfiable or is at most $(7/8+\epsilon)$-satisfiable. However, according to (Theorem 3) the latter problem is NP-hard. This would imply P = NP, contradicting the assumption.

The following lemma encapsulates the properties of the reduction described in this section, and it allows us to prove Theorem 2.

Lemma 3. *Given an instance S of MAX-(3,3)-SAT with n variables and optimum value $opt(S)$, we can construct an instance I of geometric set cover with axis-parallel segments in 2D, such that:*

(1) For every solution X of instance I, there exists a solution of S that satisfies at least $15n - |X|$ clauses.

(2) For every solution of instance S that satisfies w clauses, there exists a solution of I of size $15n - w$.

(3) Every solution with 1/2-extensions of I is also a solution to the original instance I.

Therefore, the optimum size of a solution of I is $opt(I) = 15n - opt(S)$.

We prove Lemma 3 in subsequent sections, but meanwhile let us prove Theorem 2 using Lemma 3 and Theorem 3.

TODO: This below can't use current template

Proof of Theorem 2.

Consider any $0 < \epsilon < 1/(15 \cdot 8)$.

Let us assume that there exists a polynomial-time $(1+\epsilon)$-approximation algorithm for unweighted geometric set cover with axis-parallel segments in 2D with (1/2)-extensions. We construct an algorithm that solves the problem stated in Theorem 3, thereby proving that P = NP.

Take an instance S of MAX-(3,3)-SAT to be distinguished and construct an instance of geometric set cover I using Lemma 3. We now use the $(1+\epsilon)$-approximation algorithm for geometric set cover on I. Denote the size of the solution returned by this algorithm as $approx(I)$. We prove that if in S one can satisfy at most $(\frac{7}{8}+\epsilon)n$ clauses, then $approx(I) \geq 15n - (\frac{7}{8}+\epsilon)n$ and if S is satisfiable, then $approx(I) < 15n - (\frac{7}{8}+\epsilon)n$.

Assume S satisfiable. From the definition of S being satisfiable, we have:

$$opt(S) = n.$$

From Lemma 3 we have:

$$opt(I) = 14n.$$

Therefore,

$$approx(I) \leq (1+\epsilon)opt(I) = 14n(1+\epsilon) = 14n + 14\epsilon \cdot n =$$

$$= 14n + (15\epsilon - \epsilon)n < 14n + \left(\frac{1}{8} - \epsilon\right)n = 15n - \left(\frac{7}{8} + \epsilon\right)n$$

Assume S is at most $\left(\frac{7}{8}+\epsilon\right)$ satisfiable. From the defintion of S being at most $\left(\frac{7}{8}+\epsilon\right)n$ satisfiable, we have:

$$opt(S) \le \left(\frac{7}{8}+\epsilon\right)n$$

From Lemma 3 we have:

$$opt(I) \ge 15n - \left(\frac{7}{8}+\epsilon\right)n$$

Since a solution to I with $\frac{1}{2}$-extensions is also a solution without extentions, by Lemma 3 (3.), we have:

$$approx(I) \ge opt(I) = 15n - \left(\frac{7}{8}+\epsilon\right)n$$

Therefore, by using the assumed $(1+\epsilon)$-approximation algorithm, it is possible to distinguish the case when S is satisfiable from the case when it is at most $(\frac{7}{8}+\epsilon)n$ satisfiable, it suffices to compute $approx(I)$ with $15n - (\frac{7}{8}+\epsilon)n$. Hence, the assumed approximation algorithm cannot exist, unless P = NP. □

3.2.2. Reduction

We proceed to the proof of Lemma 3. That is, we show a reduction from MAX-(3,3)-SAT problem to geometric set cover with segments parallel to axis. Moreover, the obtained instance of geometric set cover will be robust to 1/2-extensions (have the same optimal solution after 1/2-extension).

The construction will be composed of 2 types of gadgets: **VARIABLE-gadgets** and **CLAUSE-gadgets**. CLAUSE-gadgets would be constructed using two **OR-gadgets** connected together. Every gadget consists of a point set and a segment set.

3.2.2.1. VARIABLE-gadget

VARIABLE-gadget is responsible for choosing the value of a variable in a CNF formula. It allows two minimum solutions of size 3 each. These two choices correspond to the two Boolean values of the variable.

Points. Define points a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h as follows, where $L = 12n$:



Figure 3.1: **VARIABLE-gadget.** We denote the set of points marked with black circles as $\mathsf{pointsVar}^i$, and they need to be covered (are part of the set $\mathcal{C}$). Note that some of the points are not marked as black dots and exists only to name segments for further reference. We denote the set of red segments as X^i_{false} and the set of blue segments as X^i_{true}.

$$\begin{array}{llll} a = (-L, 0) & b = (-\frac{2}{3}L, 0) & c = (-\frac{1}{3}L, 0) & d = (-L, 1) \\ e = (-\frac{2}{3}L, 1) & f = (-\frac{2}{3}L, 2) & g = (L, 0) & h = (L, 2) \end{array}$$

Let us define:

$$\mathsf{pointsVariable} = \{a, b, c, d, e, f\}$$

and

$$\mathsf{pointsVariable}_i = \mathsf{pointsVariable} + (0, 4i)$$

We denote $a_i = a + (0, 4i)$ etc.

Segments. Let us define:

$$\mathsf{chooseVariable}_i^{true} = \{(a_i, d_i), (b_i, f_i), (c_i, g_i)\}$$
$$\mathsf{chooseVariable}_i^{false} = \{(a_i, c_i), (d_i, e_i), (f_i, h_i)\}$$

$$\mathsf{segmentsVariable}_i = \mathsf{chooseVariable}_i^{true} \cup \mathsf{chooseVariable}_i^{false}$$

Lemma 4. *For any $1 \le i \le n$, points in* $\mathsf{pointsVariable}_i$ *can be covered using 3 segments from* $\mathsf{segmentsVariable}_i$.

Proof. We can use either set $\mathsf{chooseVariable}_i^{true}$ or $\mathsf{chooseVariable}_i^{false}$. ☐

Lemma 5. *For any $1 \le i \le n$, points in* $\mathsf{pointsVariable}_i$ *can not be covered with fewer than 3 segments from* $\mathsf{segmentsVariable}_i$.

Proof. No segment of $\mathsf{segmentsVariable}_i$ covers more than one point from $\{d_i, f_i, c_i\}$, therefore $\mathsf{pointsVariable}_i$ can not be covered with fewer than 3 segments. ☐

Lemma 6. *For every set $A \subseteq$* $\mathsf{segmentsVariable}_i$ *such that A covers* $\mathsf{pointsVariable}_i$ *and $(c_i, g_i), (f_i, h_i) \in A$, it holds that $|A| \ge 4$.*

Proof. No segment from $\mathsf{segmentsVariable}_i$ covers more than one point from $\{a_i, e_i\}$, therefore $\mathsf{pointsVariable}_i$ - $\{c_i, f_i, g_i, h_i\}$ can not be covered with fewer than 2 segments. ☐

3.2.2.2. OR-gadget

OR-gadget has 3 important segments – $x, y, result$. x and y don't count to the weight of solution of OR-gadget (they are part of different gadgets). It has a minimal solution of weight w and $result$ can be chosen only if x or y are also chosen for the solution. If none of them are chosen, then solution choosing $result$ segment has weight at least $w + 1$. Therefore the following formula holds for a solution R assuming that R uses only w from this OR-gadget:

$$(x \in R) \vee (y \in R) \iff result \in R$$

Points.

$$\begin{array}{llll} l_0 = (0,0) & m_0 = (0,1) & n_0 = (0,2) & o_0 = (0,3) \\ p_0 = (0,4) & q_0 = (1,1) & r_0 = (1,3) & s_0 = (2,1) \\ t_0 = (2,2) & u_0 = (2,3) & v_0 = (3,2) & \end{array}$$

$$vec_{i,j} = (10i + 3 + 3j, 4n + 2j)$$

Define $\{l_{i,j}, m_{i,j} \dots v_{i,j}\}$ as $\{l_0, m_0 \dots v_0\}$ shifted by $vec_{i,j}$

Note that $v_{i,0} = l_{i,1}$ (see Figure 3.3)

$$\mathsf{pointsOrGadget}_{i,j} = \{l_{i,j}, m_{i,j}, n_{i,j}, o_{i,j}, p_{i,j}, q_{i,j}, r_{i,j}, s_{i,j}, t_{i,j}, u_{i,j}\}$$



Figure 3.2: **OR-gadget.** Figure presenting $\mathsf{orGadget}_{i,j}$: segments from $or_{i,j}^{false}$ are red, segments from $or_{i,j}^{true}$ are blue, segments from $\mathsf{orMoveVariable}_{i,j}$ are yellow and green.

Segments. We define names subsets of segments, to refer to them in lemmas.

$$or_{i,j}^{false} = \{(q_{i,j}, r_{i,j}), (s_{i,j}, u_{i,j})\}$$
$$or_{i,j}^{true} = \{(m_{i,j}, s_{i,j}), (o_{i,j}, u_{i,j}), (t_{i,j}, v_{i,j})\}$$

$$\mathsf{orMoveVariable}_{i,j} = \{(l_{i,j}, n_{i,j}), (n_{i,j}, p_{i,j})\}$$

Segments in OR-gadget:

$$\mathsf{segmentsOrGadget}_{i,j} = or_{i,j}^{false} \cup or_{i,j}^{true} \cup \mathsf{orMoveVariable}_{i,j}$$

Lemma 7. *For any $1 \leq i \leq n, j \in \{0,1\}$ and $x \in \{l_{i,j}, p_{i,j}\}$ points in $\mathsf{pointsOrGadget}_{i,j} - \{x\} \cup \{v_{i,j}\}$ can be covered with 4 segments from $\mathsf{segmentsOrGadget}_{i,j}$.*

Proof. We can do that using one segment from $\mathsf{orMoveVariable}_{i,j}$ (chosen depending on the value of x) and all segments from $or_{i,j}^{true}$. ◻

Lemma 8. *For any $1 \leq i \leq n, j \in \{0,1\}$, points in $\mathsf{pointsOrGadget}_{i,j}$ can be covered with 4 segments from $\mathsf{segmentsOrGadget}_{i,j}$.*

Proof. We can do that using $\mathsf{orMoveVariable}_{i,j}$ and $or_{i,j}^{false}$. ◻

Lemma 9. *For any $1 \leq i \leq n, j \in \{0,1\}$ and $x \in \{l_{i,j}, p_{i,j}\}$ points in $\mathsf{pointsOrGadget}_{i,j} - \{x\} \cup \{v_{i,j}\}$ can not be covered with with less than 4 segments from $\mathsf{segmentsOrGadget}_{i,j}$.*

Proof. TODO ◻

Lemma 10. *For any $1 \leq i \leq n, j \in \{0, 1\}$, points in* $\mathsf{pointsOrGadget}_{i,j}$ *can not be covered with less than 4 segments from* $\mathsf{segmentsOrGadget}_{i,j}$.

Proof. TODO ☐

3.2.2.3. CLAUSE-gadget

CLAUSE-gadget is responsible for calculating if choice of the variable values meets the clause in formula. It has minimal solution of weight w if at least one variable in the clause has a correct value. Otherwise it has minimal solution $w + 1$. This way by the minimal solution for the whole problem, we can tell how many clauses were satisfiable.

The CLAUSE-gadgets consist of two OR-gadgets. We don't want the CLAUSE-gadgets to be crammed somewhere between the very long variable segments. That's why we have a simple gadget to *pass* the value of the segment, ie. segments $(x_{i,0}, x_{i,1}), (y_{i,0}, y_{i,1}), (z_{i,0}, z_{i,1})$. Two segments and one of them is chosen if x was chosen in the solution and the other one if x wasn't.



Figure 3.3: **CLAUSE-gadget.** We denote set of these points as $\mathsf{pointsClause}_i$. Every green rectangle is an OR-gadget. y-coordinates of $x_{i,0}$, $y_{i,0}$ and $z_{i,0}$ depend on the values of variables in the i-th clause.

Points. TODO: Rephrase it

Assuming clause $C_i = x_i \vee y_i \vee z_i$, function $idx(w)$ is returning index of the variable w, function $neg(w)$ is returning whether variable w is negated in a clause.

$$\begin{aligned}
x_{i,0} &= (10i + 1, 4 \cdot idx(x_i) + 2 \cdot neg(x_i)) \quad & x_{i,1} &= (10i + 1, 4n) \\
y_{i,0} &= (10i + 2, 4 \cdot idx(y_i) + 2 \cdot neg(y_i)) \quad & y_{i,1} &= (10i + 2, 4n + 4) \\
z_{i,0} &= (10i + 3, 4 \cdot idx(z_i) + 2 \cdot neg(z_i)) \quad & z_{i,1} &= (10i + 3, 4n + 6)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathsf{moveVariable}_i = \{x_{i,j} : j \in \{0,1\}\} \cup \{y_{i,j} : j \in \{0,1\}\} \cup \{z_{i,j} : j \in \{0,1\}\}$$

$$\mathsf{pointsClause}_i = \mathsf{moveVariable}_i \cup \mathsf{pointsOrGadget}_{i,0} \cup \mathsf{pointsOrGadget}_{i,1} \cup \{v_{i,1}\}$$

Segments.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{segmentsClause}_i \quad = \quad & \{(x_{i,0}, x_{i,1}), (y_{i,0}, y_{i,1}), (z_{i,0}, z_{i,1}), (x_{i,1}, l_{i,0}), (y_{i,1}, p_{i,0}), (z_{i,1}, p_{i,1}), \} \cup \\ & \cup \mathsf{segmentsOrGadget}_{i,0} \cup \mathsf{segmentsOrGadget}_{i,1}\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 11. *For any $1 \le i \le n$ and $a \in \{x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}\}$, there is $\mathsf{solClause}_i^{true,a} \subset \mathsf{segmentsClause}_i$ with $|\mathsf{solClause}_i^{true,a}| = 11$ that covers points in $\mathsf{pointsClause}_i - \{a\}$.*

Proof. For $a = x_{i,0}$ (analogous proof for $y_{i,0}$): First we use Lemma 7 twice with excluded $x = l_{i,0}$ and $x = l_{i,1} = v_{i,0}$, resulting with 8 segments $or_{i,0}^{true} \cup or_{i,1}^{true}$ which cover all required points apart from $x_{i,1}, y_{i,0}, y_{i,1}, z_{i,0}, z_{i,1}, l_{i,0}$. We cover those using additional 3 segments: $\{(x_{i,1}, l_{i,0}), (y_{i,0}, y_{i,1}), (z_{i,0}, z_{i,1})\}$

For $a = z_{0,i}$: Using Lemma 8 and Lemma 7 with $x = p_{i,1}$, resulting with 8 segments $or_{i,0}^{false} \cup or_{i,1}^{true}$ which cover all required points apart from $x_{i,0}, x_{i,1}, y_{i,0}, y_{i,1}, z_{i,1}, p_{i,1}$. We cover those using additional 3 segments: $\{(x_{i,0}, x_{i,1}), (y_{i,0}, y_{i,1}), (z_{i,1}, p_{i,1})\}$. ☐

Lemma 12. *For any $1 \le i \le n$ there is $\mathsf{solClause}_i^{false} \subset \mathsf{segmentsClause}_i$ with $|\mathsf{solClause}_i^{false}| =$ 12 that covers points in $\mathsf{pointsClause}_i$.*

Proof. Using Lemma 8 twice we can cover $\mathsf{orGadget}_{i,0}$ and $\mathsf{orGadget}_{i,1}$ with 8 segments.

To cover the remaining points we additionally use: $\{(x_{i,0}, x_{i,1}), (y_{i,0}, y_{i,1}), (z_{i,0}, z_{i,1}), (t_{i,1}, v_{i,1})\}$

☐

Lemma 13. *For any $1 \le i \le n$:*

(1) points in $\mathsf{pointsClause}_i - \{x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}\}$ can not be covered using any subset of segments from $\mathsf{segmentsClause}_i$ of size smaller than 11;

(2) points in $\mathsf{pointsClause}_i$ can not be covered using any subset of segments from $\mathsf{segmentsClause}_i$ of size smaller than 12.

Proof of no cover with fewer than 12 segments. There is independent set of 12 points in $\mathsf{pointsClause}_i \supseteq \{x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}, l_{i,0}, p_{i,0}, q_{i,0}, u_{i,0}, v_{i,0} = l_{i,1}, p_{i,1}, q_{i,1}, u_{i,1}, v_{i,1}\}$. ☐

Proof of no cover with fewer than 11 segments. We can choose disjoint sets X, Y, Z such that $X \cup Y \cup Z \subseteq \mathsf{pointsClause}_i - \{x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}\}$ and there are no segments covering points from different sets. And we prove lower bounds for each of these sets.

$$X = \{x_{i,1}, y_{i,1}, z_{i,1}\}$$

Set X is an indendent set, so it must be covered with 3 segments.

$$Y = \mathsf{orGadget}_{i,0} - \{l_{i,0}, p_{i,0}\}$$
$$Z = \mathsf{orGadget}_{i,1} - \{l_{i,1}, p_{i,1}\}$$

For both Y and Z we can check all of the subsets of 3 segments with brutforce that none of them cover, so they have to be covered with 4 segments.

TODO: Funny fact, neither Y nor Z doesn't have independent set of size 4.

Therefore $\mathsf{pointsClause}_i$ must be covered with at least $3 + 4 + 4 = 11$ segments. ☐



Figure 3.4: **General schema.**
General layout of VARIABLE-gadget and CLAUSE-gadget and how they interact with each other.
TODO: Rename Choose X to VARIABLE-gadget and Clause C to CLAUSE-gadget.

3.2.2.4. Summary

Add some smart lemmas that sets will be exclusive to each other.

Lemma 14. ***Robustness to 1/2-extensions****. For every segment $s \in \mathcal{P}$, s and $s^{+1/2}$ cover the same points from $\mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. We can just check every segment. Most of the segments s are collinear only with points that lay on s, so trivially $s^{+1/2}$ cannot cover more points than s does.

TODO: list problematic segments here ☐

3.2.2.5. Summary of construction

We define:

$$\mathcal{C} := \bigcup_{1 \le i \le n} \mathsf{pointsVariable}_i \cup \mathsf{pointsClause}_i$$

$$\mathcal{P} := \bigcup_{1 \le i \le n} \mathsf{segmentsVariable}_i \cup \mathsf{segmentsClause}_i$$

The subsequent sections define these sets.

We prove some properties of different gadgets. Every segment for a gadget will only cover points in this gadget (won't interact with any diferent gadget), so we can prove lemmas *locally.*

TODO: y axis is increasing values downward on figures (not upwards like in normal).

3.2.3. Construction lemmas and proof of Lemma 3

In order to prove Lemma 3 we introduce some auxiliary lemmas proving properties of the construction described in the previous section.

Consider an instance S of MAX-(3,3)-SAT of size n with optimum solution satisfying k clauses. Let us construct an instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$ of geometric set cover as described in Section 3.2.2 for instance S of MAX-(3,3)-SAT.

Lemma 15. *Instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$ of geometric set cover admits a solution of size $15n - k$.*

Proof. Let the clauses in S be c_1, c_2 ... c_n and variables be x_1, x_2 ... x_n. Let the assignment of the variables in the optimum solution to S be $\phi : \{x_1, x_2 \dots x_n\} \to \{\texttt{true}, \texttt{false}\}$.

We cover every VARIABLE-gadget with solution described in Lemma 4, in the i-th gadget choosing the set of segments corresponding to the value of $\phi(x_i)$.

For every clause that is satisfied, say c_i, let us name the variable that is true in them a, points in $\mathsf{pointsClause}_i$ are covered with set $\mathsf{solClause}_i^{true,a}$ described in Lemma 11. For every clause that is not satisfied, say c_j, points in $\mathsf{pointsClause}_j$ are covered with set $\mathsf{solClause}_i^{false}$ described in Lemma 12.

TODO: Some text about what we define here

$$R_i = \begin{cases} \mathsf{chooseVariable}_i^{true} & \text{if } \phi(x_i) = \texttt{true} \\ \mathsf{chooseVariable}_i^{false} & \text{if } \phi(x_i) = \texttt{false} \end{cases}$$

$$C_i = \begin{cases} \mathsf{solClause}_i^{true,a} & \text{if } c_i \text{ satisfied} \\ \mathsf{solClause}_i^{false} & \text{if } c_i \text{ not satisfied} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \{R_i \cup C_i : 1 \le i \le n\}$$

This set covers all the points from $\mathcal{C}$, because the sets R_i, C_i individually cover their corresponding gadgets, proved in respective lemmas.

All of these sets are disjoint, so the size of the solution is:

$$|\mathcal{R}| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} R_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} C_i = 3n + 11k + 12(n-k) = 15n - k.$$

□

Lemma 16. *Suppose we have a solution $\mathcal{R}$ of the instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$ of geometric set cover that is of size w. Then there exists a solution of S that satisfies at least $15n - w$ clauses.*

Proof.

Let the clauses in S be c_1, c_2 ... c_n and variables be x_1, x_2 ... x_n. Given a solution $\mathcal{R}$ of the instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$ of geometric set cover, we construct a solution of S by constructing an assigment of variables $\phi : \{x_1, x_2 \dots x_n\} \to \{\texttt{true}, \texttt{false}\}$ that satisfies at least $15n - w$ clauses in S.

Variables The solution $\mathcal{R}$ needs to use at least 3 segments to cover points $\mathsf{pointsVariable}_i$ for each VARIABLE-gadget (Lemma 5). If $\mathcal{R}$ contains both segments (c_i, g_i) and (f_i, h_i), then it have used at least 4 segments (Lemma 6).

$$\begin{cases} |\mathsf{pointsVar}_i \cap \mathcal{R}| \geq 4 & \text{if } (c_i, g_i) \in \mathcal{R} \wedge (f_i, h_i) \in \mathcal{R} \\ |\mathsf{pointsVar}_i \cap \mathcal{R}| \geq 3 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

If $\mathcal{R}$ contains at most one of the segments (c_i, g_i) and (f_i, h_i), choose the corresponding variable value to the constructed assignment ϕ. If $\mathcal{R}$ contains both segments, assign the value $\phi(x_i)$ that satisfies most clauses, in which x_i occurs. Every variable is in exactly 3 clauses, so one assignment satisfies at least 2 of them. If $\mathcal{R}$ contains none of these segments, set value to false. Formally, we define the value $\phi(x_i)$ for the variable x_i as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \phi(x_i) = majority(X_i) & \text{if } (c_i, g_i) \in \mathcal{R} \wedge (f_i, h_i) \in \mathcal{R} \\ \phi(x_i) = true & \text{if } (c_i, g_i) \in \mathcal{R} \\ \phi(x_i) = false & \text{if } (f_i, h_i) \in \mathcal{R} \\ \phi(x_i) = false & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

TODO: Maybe remove section below, because we do this calculation at the end anyway To cover $\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathsf{pointsVar}^i$ we have used at least $3n + a$ segments, where a is the number of i such that we have chosen both values (c_i, g_i) and (f_i, h_i).

Clauses For a clause $C_i = x \vee y \vee z$, we need to use at least 11 segments to cover $\mathsf{pointsClause}_i - \{x, y, z\}$ in CLAUSE-gadget (Lemma 13).

TODO: maybe put something with cases and names of sets as above

Moreover, if all of the points $\{x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}\}$ are not covered by the segments from P^i_{var}, then we need to cover $\mathsf{pointsClause}_i$ with at least 12 segments by Lemma 13.

TODO: Maybe remove section below, because we do this calculation at the end anyway We covered CLAUSE-gadget with at least 11 or at least 12 segments:

$$|\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \mathsf{segmentsClause}_i \cap \mathcal{R}| \geq 11n + b$$

where b is the number of clauses where none of the segments covering the points $x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}$ were chosen in P^j_{var}.

Satisfied clauses with chosen variable assignment. Clauses for which none of the points $x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}$ were covered by segments from $\mathcal{R} \cap \mathsf{segmentsVariable}_j$, are not satisfied in ϕ, but not all clauses that cover one of these points with segment in P^j_{var} are satisfied.

Let us look at such a c_i and on points $x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}$ that are covered by P^j_{var}. Consider the cases of choosing variable value in equation (3.1).

If $\mathcal{R}$ contains only one of the segments (c_i, g_i) and (f_i, h_i), then the value $\phi(x_j)$ satisfies c_i.

If $\mathcal{R}$ contains neither (c_i, g_i) nor (f_i, h_i), then it is impossible that this point is covered in P^j_{var}.

If we chose both (c_i, g_i) and (f_i, h_i), then there are 3 clauses for which this point is covered by P^j_{var}. We chose variable value in a way that only one clause using x_j is not satisfied by the value of x_j. Therefore there are at most a clauses that are covered with 11 segments from CLAUSE-gadget, but are not satisfied.

So in the solution to this MAX-(3,3)-SAT instance that we have shown, there are at most $a+b$ unsatsfied clauses.

Conclusions We proved that given a solution of size w we have the variables assignment that satisfies at least $n-(a+b)$ clauses of S. At last we prove that $n-(a+b) \geq 15n-w$.

$$w \geq 3(n-a)+4a+11(n-b)+12b = 3n+a+11n+b = 14n+a+b$$
$$15n-w \leq 15n-14n-a-b = n-(a+b)$$

□

Proof of Lemma 3. Given an instance S of MAX-(3,3)-SAT of size n with optimum solution satisfying k clauses. Let us construct an instance of geometric set cover for S as described in Section 3.2.2 and name it I.

Given the Lemma 15, we know that there exists a solution of I of size $15n-k$, so:

$$opt(I) \leq 15n-k.$$

Since the optimum solution of S satisfies k clauses, then according to Lemma 16:

$$opt(I) \geq 15n-k.$$

Therefore solution from Lemma 15 of size $15n-k$ is an optimum solution for instance I. □

3.3. FPT for weighted segments with δ-extensions

Theorem 4 (FPT for weighted segment cover with δ-extensions)**.** *There exists an algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ that given a family $\mathcal{P}$ of n weighted segments (in any direction), a set of m points $\mathcal{C}$, and parameters k and δ, runs in time $f(k,\delta)\cdot(nm)^c$ for some computable function f and a constant c, and outputs a set $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ such that $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$ and $\mathcal{R}^{+\delta}$ covers all points in $\mathcal{C}$ or determines that such a set $\mathcal{R}$ does not exist.*

To solve this problem we will introduce a lemma about choosing *good* subsets of points.

Definition 9. For a set of collinear points C, a subset $A \subseteq C$ is (k,δ)**-good** if for any set of segments R that covers set A such that $|R| \leq k$, it holds that $R^{+\delta}$ covers C.

Lemma 17. *There exists an algorithm that for any set of collinear points C, $\delta > 0$ and $k \geq 1$, outputs a (k,δ)-good set of size at most $f(k,\delta)$ for some computable function f. This algorithm runs in time $O(|C| \cdot f(k,\delta))$.*

Proof. We prove this for a fixed δ by induction over k for any set of collinear points C.

Inductive hypothesis For any set of collinear points C, there exists an algorithm that runs in time $O(|C|k(1+\frac{1}{\delta}))$ and finds a set A such that:

- A is $(l,\delta)-good$ for every $1 \leq l \leq k$,
- A has size $|A| < f(\delta,k)$ for some computable function f,
- extreme points from C are in A.

Base case for $k = 1$ It is sufficient that A consists of 2 points: extreme points from C or a single point if $|C| = 1$.

If they are covered with one segment, it must be a segment that includes the extreme points from C, so it covers whole set C.

Inductive step Assuming inductive hypothesis for any set of collinear points C and for k, we will prove hypothesis for $k + 1$.

Let us name s the minimal segment that includes all points from C.

We define $M = \lceil 1 + \frac{2}{\delta} \rceil$ subsegments of s in the following way. We split s into M parts v_i of equal length, that is $|v_i| = \frac{|s|}{M}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq M$.

C_i is a subset of C such that they lay on v_i.

t_i is a segment connecting leftmost and rightmost point in C_i (it might be degenerated segment if $|C_i| = 1$ or it might be empty if C_i is empty).

TODO: Add a picture with v_i and t_i here

We use inductive hypothesis to choose (k, δ)-good sets A_i for sets C_i. If $|C_i| \leq 1$, then $A_i = C_i$ and it's still a (k, δ)-good set.

Then we define $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^{M} A_i$. It includes ends of s, because they are in sets A_1 and A_M.

Proof that A is (k, δ)-good for C Let us take any cover of A with $k+1$ segments and name it $\mathcal{R}$.

For every segment t_i, if there exists a segment x from $\mathcal{R}$ such that it is disjoint with t_i, then we have a cover of A_i with at most k segments using $\mathcal{R} - \{x\}$. Since A_i is (k, δ)-good for t_i and C_i, then $(\mathcal{R} - \{x\})^{+\delta}$ covers C_i.

If there exists a segment t_i for which a segment x as defined above does not exist, then all $k + 1$ segments that cover A_i intersect with t_i. (Note: There exists only one such segment t_i). From the inductive hypothesis ends of s are in A_1 and A_M respectively, so $\mathcal{R}$ must cover them. Hence there must exist segments starting in the ends of s and ending somewhere in t_i. Let us name these two segments y and z. It follows that: $|y| + |z| + |t_i| \geq |s|$. Since $|t_i| \leq |v_i| = \frac{|s|}{M} \leq \frac{|s|}{1+\frac{2}{\delta}} = \frac{|s|\delta}{\delta+2}$, therefore $max(|y|, |z|) > |s|(1 - \frac{\delta}{\delta+2})/2 = \frac{|s|}{\delta+2}$.

TODO: Add a picture with such segments here

After δ-extension, the longer of these segments will lengthen both ways by at least:

$$\frac{|s|\delta}{\delta + 2} = \frac{|s|}{1 + \frac{2}{\delta}} > \frac{|s|}{M} = v_i > t_i.$$

Therefore the longer of segments y and z will cover the segment t_i after δ-extension, therefore $\mathcal{R}^{+\delta}$ covers C_i.

Since $C = \bigcup_{i=1}^{M} C_i$, then $\mathcal{R}^{+\delta}$ covers C.

Complexity We use the recursive algorithm for subsets C_i. Every point from C belongs to at most 2 sets C_i.

Apart from recursive algorithm we perform operations linear in size of $|C| + M$ to calculate the sets C_i.

Therefore it has complexity:

$$O(|C|+M) + \sum_{i}^{M} O(|C_i|k(1+\frac{1}{\delta})) = O(|C|+(1+\frac{1}{\delta})) + O((\sum_{i}^{M} |C_i|)k(1+\frac{1}{\delta})) \leq O(|C|k(1+\frac{1}{\delta})).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 4. To construct an algorithm for this problem let us formulate some claims about the problem first.

Definition 10. Line is **long** if there are at least $k+1$ points from $\mathcal{C}$ on it.

Claim 1. *If there are more than k long lines, then $\mathcal{C}$ can not be covered with k segments.*

Claim 2. *If there is more than k^2 points from $\mathcal{C}$ that do not lie on any long line, then $\mathcal{C}$ can not be covered with k segments.*

Applying the above claims, if we have more than k long lines or more than k^2 points form $\mathcal{C}$ that do not lie on any long line, then we answer that there is no solution of size at most k.

Otherwise, we can split $\mathcal{C}$ into at most $k+1$ sets: D, at most k^2 points that do not lie on any long line and C_i – points that lay on i-th long line. Sets C_i do not need to be disjoint.

Then for every set C_i, we can use Lemma 17 to get (k,δ)-good set A_i for C_i.

Then we have set $D \cup \bigcup A_i$ of size at most $f(k,\delta)$ for some computable function f, that if we have a solution $\mathcal{R}$ of size at most k that covers $D \cup \bigcup A_i$, then $\mathcal{R}^{+\delta}$ covers $\mathcal{C}$. This is because $\mathcal{R}$ already covers points D, they cover C_i, because they cover (k,δ)-good set A_i with at most k segments, so $\mathcal{R}^{+\delta}$ covers C_i.

After that we shrunk down size of $\mathcal{C}$ to size of $f(k,\delta)$ for some computable function f. Then we would like to shrink down size of $\mathcal{P}$. For every collinear subset of D, we can choose one segment from $\mathcal{P}$ that covers these points and have the lowest weight or decide there is no segment that cover them. There are at most $|D|^2$ different segments, because we can distnguish these collinear sets by their extreme points.

This has complexity $O(|D|^2|\mathcal{P}|)$ and produce shrunk down set $\mathcal{P}$ of size $f(k,\delta)$ for some computable function f.

Then we can iterate over all subsets of shrunk down set $\mathcal{P}$ and choose the set with the lowest sum of weights that cover D. This solution would have weight not larger than optimal solution for the problem without extension, because we iterate over all posibilities of covering the subset of $\mathcal{C}$.

□

3.4. W[1]-completeness for weighted segments in 3 directions

Theorem 5. ***W[1]-completeness for weighted segments in 3 directions**. Consider the problem of covering a set $\mathcal{C}$ of points by selecting k axis-pararell or right-diagonal weighted segments with weights from a set $\mathcal{P}$ with minimal weight. Assuming ETH, there is no algorithm for this problem with running time $f(k)\cdot(|\mathcal{C}|+|\mathcal{P}|)^{o(\sqrt{(k)})}$ for any computable function f.*

We will show reduction from grid tiling problem.

Let's have an instance of grid tiling problem – size of the gird k, number of elements available n and k^2 sets of available pairs in every tile $S_{i,j} \subseteq \{1,n\} \times \{1,n\}$.

Construction. We construct a set $\mathcal{P}$ of segments and a set $\mathcal{C}$ of points.

First let's choose any ordering of n^2 elements $\{1,n\} \times \{1,n\}$ and name this sequence $a_1 \dots a_{n^2}$.

$$match_v(i,j) \iff a_i = \{x_i, y_i\} \wedge a_j = \{x_j, y_j\} \wedge x_i = x_j$$

$$match_h(i,j) \iff a_i = \{x_i, y_i\} \wedge a_j = \{x_j, y_j\} \wedge y_i = y_j$$

Points. Define points:

$$h_{i,j,t} = (j \cdot (n^2+1) + t, (n^2+1) \cdot i)$$

$$v_{i,j,t} = ((n^2+1) \cdot i, j \cdot (n^2+1) + t)$$

Let's define sets H and V as:

$$H = \{h_{i,j,t} : 1 \leq i, j, \leq k, 1 \leq t \leq n^2\}$$

$$V = \{v_{i,j,t} : 1 \leq i, j, \leq k, 1 \leq t \leq n^2\}$$

Let's define $\epsilon = 0.1$. For a point $\{x, y\} = p$ we define points $p^L = \{x-\epsilon, y\}$, $p^R = \{x+\epsilon, y\}$, $p^U = \{x, y-\epsilon\}$, and $p^D = \{x, y+\epsilon\}$.

Then we define:

$$\mathcal{C} := H \cup \{p^L : p \in H\} \cup \{p^R : p \in H\} \cup V \cup \{p^U : p \in V\} \cup \{p^D : p \in V\}$$

Segments. Define horizontal segments.

$$hor_{i,j,t_1,t_2} = (h^R_{i,j,t_1}, h^L_{i,j+1,t_2})$$

$$ver_{i,j,t_1,t_2} = (v^D_{i,j,t_1}, v^U_{i,j+1,t_2})$$

$$horbeg_{i,t} = (h^L_{i,1,1}, h^L_{i,1,t})$$

$$horend_{i,t} = (h^R_{i,n,t}, h^R_{i,n,n^2})$$

$$verbeg_{i,t} = (v^U_{i,1,1}, v^U_{i,1,t})$$

$$verend_{i,t} = (v^D_{i,n,t}, v^D_{i,n,n^2})$$

$$\begin{aligned} HOR &= \{hor_{i,j,t_1,t_2} : 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j < k, 1 \leq t_1, t_2 \leq n^2, match_h(t_1, t_2)\} \\ &\cup \{horbeg_{i,t} : 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq t \leq n^2\} \\ &\cup \{horend_{i,t} : 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq t \leq n^2\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} VER &= \{ver_{i,j,t_1,t_2} : 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j < k, 1 \leq t_1, t_2 \leq n^2, match_v(t_1, t_2)\} \\ &\cup \{verbeg_{i,t} : 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq t \leq n^2\} \\ &\cup \{verend_{i,t} : 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq t \leq n^2\} \end{aligned}$$

$$DIAG := \{(h_{i,j,t}, v_{j,i,t}) : 1 \leq i, j \leq k, 1 \leq t \leq n^2, a_t \in S_{i,j}\}$$

TODO: explain that these segments are in fact diagonal

$$\mathcal{P} := HOR \cup VER \cup DIAG$$

Lemma 18. *If there exists solution for grid tiling, then there exists solution for our construction using $2(k+1)k + k^2$ segments with weight exactly $2k \cdot (k(n^2+1) - 2 - 2\epsilon(k-1))$.*

Claim 3. *If there exists a solution to the grid tiling $c_1 \dots c_k$ and $r_1 \dots r_k$, then there exists a solution covering all points*

$$\{h_{i,j,t} : 1 \leq i, j \leq k, t = (c_i, r_j)\} \cup \{v_{i,j,t} : 1 \leq i, j \leq k, t = (c_j, r_i)\}$$

with segments in $DIAG$ and the rest in VER or HOR and has weight $2k \cdot (k(n^2+1) - 2 - 2\epsilon(k-1))$.

Proof. TODO: jakiś prosty z definicji

Lemma 19. *If there exists solution for our construction using $2(k+1)k + k^2$ segments with weight exactly $2k \cdot (k(n^2+1) - 2 - 2\epsilon(k-1))$, then there exists a solution for grid tiling*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 20, because we just take which points are covered with $DIAG$.

Claim 4. *Points p^L, p^R, p^U, p^D cannot be covered with $DIAG$.*

Claim 5. *Points in $H \cup \{p^L : p \in H\} \cup \{p^R : p \in H\}$ cannot be covered with VER.*

Points in $V \cup \{p^U : p \in V\} \cup \{p^D : p \in V\}$ cannot be covered with HOR.

Claim 6. *For given i, j if none of the points $h_{i,j,t}$ ($v_{i,j,t}$) for $1 \leq t \leq n^2$ are covered with $DIAG$, then some spaces between neighbouring points were covered twice.*

Claim 7. *For given i, j two points h_{i,j,t_1}, h_{i,j,t_2} (v_{i,j,t_1}, v_{i,j,t_2}) for $1 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq n^2$ are covered with $DIAG$, then one of them had to be also covered with a segment from HOR (VER).*

Proof. Point v^L_{i,j,t_2} had to be covered with VER from Claims 4 and 5. And every segment in VER covering v^L_{i,j,t_2}, covers also v^L_{i,j,t_1}.

Lemma 20. *If there exists solution for our construction with weight at most (exactly) $2k \cdot (k(n^2+1) - 2 - 2\epsilon(k-1))$, then for every i, j there must be exactly one t such that $h_{i,j,t}$ ($v_{i,j,t}$) is covered with $DIAG$ and moreover if h_{i,j,t_1} and $h_{i,j+1,t_2}$ are uncovered, then $math_h(t_1, t_2)$. Analogically for v.*

Proof. Only k^2 points can be covered only in $DIAG$, the rest has to be covered with $VER \cup HOR$. Therefore every result must be at least ALL_LINES - $2k^2\epsilon$, because only $2k^2$ spaces of length ϵ can be uncovered in this axis.

Of course if h_{i,j,t_1} and $h_{i,j+1,t_2}$ are uncovered, then there must exist a segment in HOR between h^R_{i,j,t_1} and $h^L_{i,j+1,t_2}$, so $math_h(t_1, t_2)$ must be true.

3.5. What is missing

We don't know FPT for axis-pararell segments without δ-extensions.

Chapter 4

Geometric Set Cover with lines

4.1. Lines parallel to one of the axis

When $\mathcal{R}$ consists only of lines parallel to one of the axis, the problem can be solved in polynomial time.

We create bipartial graph G with node for every line on the input split into sets: H – horizontal lines and V – vertical lines. If any two lines cover the same point from $\mathcal{C}$, then we add edge between them.

Of course there will be no edges between nodes inside H, because all of them are pararell and if they share one point, they are the same lines. Similar argument for V. So the graph is bipartial.

Now Geometric Set Cover can be solved with Vertex Cover on graph G. Since Vertex Cover (even in weighted setting) on bipartial graphs can be solved in polynomial time.

Short note for myself just to remember how to this in polynomial time:

Non-weighted setting - Konig theorem + max matching

Weighted setting - Min cut in graph of $\neg A$ or $\neg B$ (edges directed from V to H)

4.2. FPT for arbitrary lines

You can find this is Platypus book. We will show FPT kernel of size at most k^2.

(Maybe we need to reduce lines with one point/points with one line).

For every line if there is more than k points on it, you have to take it. At the end, if there is more than k^2 points, return NO. Otherwise there is no more than k^4 lines.

In weighted settings among the same lines with different weights you leave the cheapest one and use the same algorithm.

4.3. APX-completeness for arbitrary lines

We will show a reduction from Vertex Cover problem. Let's take an instance of the Vertex Cover problem for graph G. We will create a set of $|V(G)|$ pairwise non-pararell lines, such that no three of them share a common point.

Then for every edge in $(v, w) \in E(G)$ we put a point on crossing of lines for vertices v and w. They are not pararell, so there exists exactly one such point and any other line don't cover this point (any three of them don't cross in the same point).

Solution of Geometric Set Cover for this instance would yield a sound solution of Vertex Cover for graph G. For every point (edge) we need to choose at least one of lines (vertices) v or w to cover this point.

Vertex Cover for arbitrary graph is APX-complete, so this problem in also APX-complete.

4.4. 2-approximation for arbitrary lines

Vertex Cover has an easy 2-approximation algorithm, but here very many lines can cross through the same point, so we can do d-approximation, where d is the biggest number of lines crossing through the same point. So for set where any 3 lines don't cross in the same point it yields 2-approximation.

The problematic cases are where through all points cross at least k points and all lines have at least k points on them. It can be created by casting k-grid in k-D space on 2D space.

Greedy algorithm yields $\log|\mathcal{R}|$-approximation, but I have example for this for bipartial graph and reduction with taking all lines crossing through some point (if there are no more than k) would solve this case. So maybe it works.

Unfortunaly I haven't done this :(

I can link some papers telling it's hard to do.

4.5. Connection with general set cover

Problem with finite set of lines with more dimensions is equivalent to problem in 2D, because we can project lines on the plane which is not perpendicular to any plane created by pairs of (point from $\mathcal{C}$, line from $\mathcal{P}$).

Of course every two lines have at most one common point, so is every family of sets that have at most one point in common equivalent to some geometric set cover with lines?

No, because of Desargues's theorem. Have to write down exactly what configuration is banned.

Chapter 5

Geometric Set Cover with polygons

5.1. State of the art

Covering points with weighted discs admits PTAS [Li and Jin, 2015] and with fat polygons with δ-extensions with unit weights admits EPTAS [Har-Peled and Lee, 2009].

Although with thin objects, even if we allow δ-expansion, the Set Cover with rectangles is APX-complete (for $\delta = 1/2$), it follows from APX-completeness for segments with δ-expansion in Section 3.2.

Covering points with squares is W[1]-hard [Marx, 2005]. It can be proven that assuming $SETH$, there is no $f(k) \cdot (|\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{P}|)^{k-\epsilon}$ time algorithm for any computable function f and $\epsilon > 0$ that decides if there are k polygons in $\mathcal{P}$ that together cover $\mathcal{C}$, *Theorem 1.9* in [Marx and Pilipczuk, 2015].

Chapter 6

Conclusions

Bibliography

[Har-Peled and Lee, 2009] Har-Peled, S. and Lee, M. (2009). Weighted geometric set cover problems revisited. *Journal of Computational Geometry*, 3.

[Håstad, 2001] Håstad, J. (2001). Some optimal inapproximability results. *J. ACM*, 48(4):798–859.

[Li and Jin, 2015] Li, J. and Jin, Y. (2015). A PTAS for the weighted unit disk cover problem. *CoRR*, abs/1502.04918.

[Marx, 2005] Marx, D. (2005). Efficient approximation schemes for geometric problems? In Brodal, G. S. and Leonardi, S., editors, *Algorithms – ESA 2005*, pages 448–459, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

[Marx and Pilipczuk, 2015] Marx, D. and Pilipczuk, M. (2015). Optimal parameterized algorithms for planar facility location problems using voronoi diagrams. *CoRR*, abs/1504.05476.