

1

University of Warsaw

2

Faculty of Mathematics, Informatics and Mechanics

3

Katarzyna Kowalska

Student no. 371053

4

5

Approximation and Parametrized Algorithms for Segment Set Cover

6

Master's thesis

7

in COMPUTER SCIENCE

8

Supervisor:

dr Michał Pilipczuk

Instytut Informatyki

9

June 2020

10 **Supervisor's statement**

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

13 Date

Supervisor's signature

14 **Author's statement**

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

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

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

21 Date

Author's signature

22

Abstract

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

25

Keywords

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

28

Thesis domain (Socrates-Erasmus subject area codes)

29 11.3 Informatyka

30

31

Subject classification

32 D. Software

33 D.127. Blabalgorithms

34 D.127.6. Numerical blabalalysis

35

Tytuł pracy w języku polskim

36 Algorytmy parametryzowania i trudność aproksymacji problemu pokrywania zbiorów
37 odcinkami na płaszczyźnie

Contents

39	1. Introduction	5
40	2. Definitions	7
41	2.1. Geometric Set Cover	7
42	2.2. Approximation	7
43	2.3. δ -extensions	7
44	3. APX-completeness Geometric Set Cover	9
45	3.1. APX-completeness for segments parallel to axes	9
46	3.1.1. MAX-(3,3)-SAT and statement of reduction	9
47	3.1.2. Reduction	11
48	3.1.2.1. VARIABLE-gadget	11
49	3.1.2.2. OR-gadget	12
50	3.1.2.3. CLAUSE-gadget	14
51	3.1.2.4. Summary	16
52	3.1.2.5. Summary of construction	16
53	3.1.3. Construction lemmas and proof of Lemma 3.1	16
54	4. FPT for Geometric Set Cover for segments with δ-extensions	21
55	4.1. FPT for segments	21
56	4.1.1. Axis-parallel segments	21
57	4.1.2. Segments in arbitrary directions	22
58	4.2. FPT for weighted segments with δ -extensions	23
59	5. W[1]-completeness for weighted segments in 3 directions	29
60	6. Geometric Set Cover with lines	35
61	6.1. Lines parallel to one of the axis	35
62	6.2. FPT for arbitrary lines	35
63	6.3. APX-completeness for arbitrary lines	35
64	6.4. 2-approximation for arbitrary lines	36
65	6.5. Connection with general set cover	36
66	7. Geometric Set Cover with polygons	37
67	7.1. State of the art	37
68	8. Conclusions	39

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 where 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 sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, the problem
does not admit $1 + \epsilon$ -approximation scheme) [referencje].

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 seg-
ments 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 unweighted 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.

101 Chapter 2

102 Definitions

103 2.1. Geometric Set Cover

104 In the geometric set cover problem we are given \mathcal{P} – a set of objects, which are connected
105 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
106 every point in \mathcal{C} is inside some element from \mathcal{R} and $|\mathcal{R}|$ is minimized.

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

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

110 2.2. Approximation

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

113 **Definition 2.1.** A **polynomial-time approximation scheme (PTAS)** for a minimization
114 problem Π is a family of algorithms \mathcal{A}_ϵ for every $\epsilon > 0$ such that \mathcal{A}_ϵ takes an instance I of Π
115 and in polynomial time finds a solution that is within a factor $(1 + \epsilon)$ of being optimal. That
116 means the reported solution has weight at most $(1 + \epsilon)\text{opt}(I)$, where $\text{opt}(I)$ is the weight of
117 an optimal solution for I .

118 **Definition 2.2.** A problem Π is **APX-hard** if assuming $P \neq NP$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such
119 that there is no polynomial-time $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for Π .

120 2.3. δ -extensions

121 TODO PLACEHOLDER for introductory text

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

124 **Definition 2.3** (δ -extensions for center-symmetric objects). For any $\delta > 0$ and a center-
125 symmetric object L with centre of symmetry $S = (x_s, y_s)$, the **δ -extension** of L is the object
126 $L^{+\delta} = \{(1 + \delta) \cdot (x - x_s, y - y_s) + (x_s, y_s) : (x, y) \in L\}$, that is, $L^{+\delta}$ is the image of L under
127 homothety centered at S with scale $(1 + \delta)$

128 The geometric set cover problem with δ -extensions is a modified version of geometric set
129 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 2.4 (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. $|\mathcal{R}| \leq |\text{opt}(I)|$.

TODO: Some text

Definition 2.5 (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. $(1 + \epsilon)|\mathcal{R}| \leq |\text{opt}(I)|$.

Chapter 3

APX-completeness Geometric Set Cover

3.1. 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 3.1. *(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 3.1 implies the following.

Corollary 3.1. *(rectangle set cover is APX-hard). Unweighted geometric set cover with rectangles (even with $1/2$ -extension) is APX-hard.*

We prove Theorem 3.1 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.

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

Definition 3.1. 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 3.2. 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 3.1 we use hardness of approximation of MAX-(3,3)-SAT proved in [Håstad, 2001] and described in Theorem 3.2 below.

Definition 3.3 (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 3.2. [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 3.2) 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 3.1.

Lemma 3.1. *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 3.1 in subsequent sections, but meanwhile let us prove Theorem 3.1 using Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 3.2.

Proof of Theorem 3.1.

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 3.2, 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 3.1. 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 3.1 we have:

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

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} approx(I) &\leq (1 + \epsilon)opt(I) = 14n(1 + \epsilon) = 14n + 14\epsilon \cdot n = \\ &= 14n + (15\epsilon - \epsilon)n < 14n + \left(\frac{1}{8} - \epsilon\right)n = 15n - \left(\frac{7}{8} + \epsilon\right)n \end{aligned}$$

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

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

From Lemma 3.1 we have:

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

205 Since a solution to I with $\frac{1}{2}$ -extensions is also a solution without extensions, by Lemma
206 3.1 (3.), we have:

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

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

211 3.1.2. Reduction

212 We proceed to the proof of Lemma 3.1. That is, we show a reduction from MAX-(3,3)-SAT
213 problem to geometric set cover with segments parallel to axis. Moreover, the obtained instance
214 of geometric set cover will be robust to $1/2$ -extensions (have the same optimal solution after
215 $1/2$ -extension).

216 The construction will be composed of 2 types of gadgets: **VARIABLE-gadgets** and
217 **CLAUSE-gadgets**. **CLAUSE-gadgets** would be constructed using two **OR-gadgets** con-
218 nected together.

219 3.1.2.1. VARIABLE-gadget

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

223 **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 pointsVariable_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 $\text{chooseVariable}_i^{\text{false}}$ and the set of blue segments as $\text{chooseVariable}_i^{\text{true}}$.

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

Let us define:

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

and

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

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

Segments. Let us define:

$$\text{chooseVariable}_i^{\text{true}} = \{(a_i, d_i), (b_i, f_i), (c_i, g_i)\}$$

$$\text{chooseVariable}_i^{\text{false}} = \{(a_i, c_i), (d_i, e_i), (f_i, h_i)\}$$

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

Lemma 3.2. For any $1 \leq i \leq n$, points in pointsVariable_i can be covered using 3 segments from $\text{segmentsVariable}_i$.

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

Lemma 3.3. For any $1 \leq i \leq n$, points in pointsVariable_i can not be covered with fewer than 3 segments from $\text{segmentsVariable}_i$.

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

Lemma 3.4. For every set $A \subseteq \text{segmentsVariable}_i$ such that A covers pointsVariable_i and $(c_i, g_i), (f_i, h_i) \in A$, it holds that $|A| \geq 4$.

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

3.1.2.2. OR-gadget

OR-segment connects input and output segments that are connected to other parts of constructions.

Output segment is part of OR-segment, but input is not.

For every solution \mathcal{R} of the whole construction. Define \mathcal{R}' as intersection of \mathcal{R} and the gadget segments. Minimum solution of OR-gadget has size w , i.e. $|\mathcal{R}'| \leq w$. *output* segments can be part of \mathcal{R}' only if *input_x* or *input_y* are part of the chosen solution \mathcal{R} . If none of them are chosen, then solution containing *output* segment has weight at least $w + 1$. Therefore the following formula holds:

$$\text{output} \in \mathcal{R}' \wedge |\mathcal{R}'| = w \Rightarrow (x \in \mathcal{R}) \vee (y \in \mathcal{R})$$

Only 3 points that belong to this segment: $l_{i,j}, p_{i,j}, v_{i,j}$ can be covered by segment not from the OR-gadget.



Figure 3.2: **OR-gadget**. Figure presenting OR-gadget: segments from $\text{chooseOr}_{i,j}^{false}$ are red, segments from $\text{chooseOr}_{i,j}^{true}$ are blue, segments from $\text{orMoveVariable}_{i,j}$ are yellow and green. Dark blue segment is an *output* segment. Grey segments $input_x$ and $input_y$ are input segments that are not part of $\text{segmentsOr}_{i,j}$.

249 **Points.**

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

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

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

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

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

253 Note that $\text{pointsOr}_{i,j}$ does not include point $v_{i,j}$

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

$$\text{chooseOr}_{i,j}^{false} = \{(q_{i,j}, r_{i,j}), (s_{i,j}, u_{i,j})\}$$

$$\text{chooseOr}_{i,j}^{true} = \{(m_{i,j}, s_{i,j}), (o_{i,j}, u_{i,j}), (t_{i,j}, v_{i,j})\}$$

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

255 Segments in OR-gadget:

$$\text{segmentsOr}_{i,j} = \text{chooseOr}_{i,j}^{false} \cup \text{chooseOr}_{i,j}^{true} \cup \text{orMoveVariable}_{i,j}$$

256 **Lemma 3.5.** For any $1 \leq i \leq n, j \in \{0, 1\}$ and $x \in \{l_{i,j}, p_{i,j}\}$, points in $\text{pointsOr}_{i,j} - \{x\} \cup$
 257 $\{v_{i,j}\}$ can be covered with 4 segments from $\text{segmentsOr}_{i,j}$.

258 *Proof.* We can do that using one segment from $\text{orMoveVariable}_{i,j}$, the one that does not cover
 259 x , and all segments from $\text{chooseOr}_{i,j}^{true}$. \square

260 **Lemma 3.6.** For any $1 \leq i \leq n, j \in \{0, 1\}$, points in $\text{pointsOr}_{i,j}$ can be covered with 4
 261 segments from $\text{segmentsOr}_{i,j}$.

262 *Proof.* We can do that using segments from $\text{orMoveVariable}_{i,j}$ and $\text{chooseOr}_{i,j}^{\text{false}}$. \square

263 3.1.2.3. CLAUSE-gadget

264 CLAUSE-gadget is responsible for calculating if variables values assigned in variable gadgets
 265 satisfy the respective clause in CNF. It has minimum solution of weight w if and only if the
 266 clause is satisfied, i.e. at least one of the respective variables is assigned a correct value.
 267 Otherwise it has minimum solution of weight $w + 1$. This way, by analyzing the minimum
 268 solution for the whole problem, we can tell how many clauses were possible to satisfy in the
 269 optimum solution of CNF.

270 The CLAUSE-gadgets consist of two OR-gadgets. It would be inconvenient to posi-
 271 tion the CLAUSE-gadgets in between the very long variable segments. Instead, we use
 272 a simple auxiliary gadget to *transfer* whether the segment is in a solution, i.e. segments
 273 $(x_{i,0}, x_{i,1}), (y_{i,0}, y_{i,1}), (z_{i,0}, z_{i,1})$. Each gadget consists of two segments $(x_{i,0}, x_{i,1}), (x_{i,1}, a)$.
 274 These are the only segments that can cover $x_{i,1}$. If $x_{i,0}$ is already covered by some other
 275 gadget, we can cover $x_{i,1}$ by the other segment covering another point from the gadget, say a .
 276 If $x_{i,0}$ is not covered, then the only way to cover $x_{i,0}$ is to use segment $(x_{i,0}, x_{i,1})$. Intuitively,
 277 the two segments *transfer* the state of $x_{i,0}$ onto a , but there are less restrictions on where a
 278 can be placed, simplifying the construction.



Figure 3.3: **CLAUSE-gadget.** This figure presents CLAUSE-gadget. Every green rectangle is an OR-gadget. y -coordinates of $x_{i,0}$, $y_{i,0}$ and $z_{i,0}$ depend on the variables in the i -th clause. Grey segments corresponds to the values of variables satisfying the i -th clause.

279 **Points.** TODO: Rephrase it

280 Assuming clause $C_i = a \vee b \vee c$, function $\text{idx}(w)$ returns index of the variable w , function
 281 $\text{neg}(w)$ returns whether variable w is negated in a clause.

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

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

$$\text{pointsClause}_i = \text{moveVariable}_i \cup \text{pointsOr}_{i,0} \cup \text{pointsOr}_{i,1} \cup \{v_{i,1}\}$$

Segments.

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

Lemma 3.7. For any $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $a \in \{x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}\}$, there is a $\text{solClause}_i^{\text{true},a} \subset \text{segmentsClause}_i$ with $|\text{solClause}_i^{\text{true},a}| = 11$ that covers points in $\text{pointsClause}_i - \{a\}$.

Proof. For $a = x_{i,0}$ (analogous proof for $y_{i,0}$): First we use Lemma 3.5 twice with excluded $x = l_{i,0}$ and $x = l_{i,1} = v_{i,0}$, resulting with 8 segments $\text{chooseOr}_{i,0}^{\text{true}} \cup \text{chooseOr}_{i,1}^{\text{true}}$ 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 $a = z_{i,0}$: Using Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.5 with $x = p_{i,1}$, resulting with 8 segments $\text{chooseOr}_{i,0}^{\text{false}} \cup \text{chooseOr}_{i,1}^{\text{true}}$ 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: $\{(x_{i,0}, x_{i,1}), (y_{i,0}, y_{i,1}), (z_{i,1}, p_{i,1})\}$. \square

Lemma 3.8. For any $1 \leq i \leq n$ there is $\text{solClause}_i^{\text{false}} \subset \text{segmentsClause}_i$ with $|\text{solClause}_i^{\text{false}}| = 12$ that covers points in pointsClause_i .

Proof. Using Lemma 3.6 twice we can cover $\text{pointsOr}_{i,0}$ and $\text{pointsOr}_{i,1}$ with 8 segments.

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

Lemma 3.9. For any $1 \leq i \leq n$:

(1) points in pointsClause_i can not be covered using any subset of segments from segmentsClause_i of size smaller than 12;

(2) points in $\text{pointsClause}_i - \{x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}\}$ can not be covered using any subset of segments from segmentsClause_i of size smaller than 11.

Proof of (1). No segment in segmentsClause_i covers more than 2 points from $\{x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}, l_{i,0}, p_{i,0}, q_{i,0}, u_{i,0}, v_{i,0}, l_{i,1}, p_{i,1}, q_{i,1}, u_{i,1}, v_{i,1}\}$.

Therefore we need to use at least 12 segments. \square

Proof of (2). We can choose disjoint sets X, Y, Z such that $X \cup Y \cup Z \subseteq \text{pointsClause}_i - \{x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}\}$ and there are no segments covering points from different sets. And we prove lower bounds for each of these sets.

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

No two points in X are covered with one segment of segmentsClause_i , so it must be covered with 3 different segments.

$$Y = \text{pointsOr}_{i,0} - \{l_{i,0}, p_{i,0}\}$$

$$Z = \text{pointsOr}_{i,1} - \{l_{i,1}, p_{i,1}\}$$

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

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

Therefore pointsClause_i must be covered with at least $3 + 4 + 4 = 11$ segments. \square

3.1.2.4. Summary

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

Lemma 3.10. 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

In the same gadget: $(n_{i,j}, p_{i,j})$ does not cover $m_{i,j}$ and symmetrically. $(t_{i,j}, v_{i,j})$ does not cover $n_{i,j}$. $(o_{i,0}, u_{i,0})$ does not cover $m_{i,1}$ and symmetrically. $(y_{i,1}, p_{i,0})$ does not cover $n_{i,j}$.

From different gadgets: (b_i, f_i) after $\frac{1}{2}$ -extensions does not cover b_{i+1} point.

VARIABLE-gadget's (a_i, c_i) after $\frac{1}{2}$ -extensions does not cover any points $x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}$ or $z_{i,0}$ from CLAUSE-gadget.

\square

3.1.2.5. Summary of construction

We define:

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

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

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 different gadget), so we can prove lemmas *locally*.

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

3.1.3. Construction lemmas and proof of Lemma 3.1

In order to prove Lemma 3.1 we introduce several 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 3.1.2 for instance S of MAX-(3,3)-SAT.

Lemma 3.11. *Instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$ of geometric set cover admits a solution of size $15n - k$.*




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.

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

We cover every VARIABLE-gadget with solution described in Lemma 3.2, 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 it as x_i and point corresponding to x_i in pointsClause_i as a . Points in pointsClause_i are covered with set $\text{solClause}_i^{\text{true}, a}$ described in Lemma 3.7. For every clause that is not satisfied, say c_j , points in pointsClause_j are covered with set $\text{solClause}_j^{\text{false}}$ described in Lemma 3.8.

Formally we define sets responsible for choosing variable and satisfying the variable, R_i and C_i respectively, as following:

$$\begin{aligned} R_i &= \begin{cases} \text{chooseVariable}_i^{\text{true}} & \text{if } \phi(x_i) = \text{true} \\ \text{chooseVariable}_i^{\text{false}} & \text{if } \phi(x_i) = \text{false} \end{cases} \\ C_i &= \begin{cases} \text{solClause}_i^{\text{true}, a} & \text{if } c_i \text{ satisfied} \\ \text{solClause}_i^{\text{false}} & \text{if } c_i \text{ not satisfied} \end{cases} \\ \mathcal{R} &= \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{R_i \cup C_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}. \end{aligned}$$

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

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

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

□

Lemma 3.12. Suppose we have a solution \mathcal{R} of the instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$ of geometric set cover. Then there exists a solution \mathcal{R}' , such that $|\mathcal{R}'| \leq |\mathcal{R}|$, and for each VARIABLE-gadget \mathcal{R}' contains at most one of the segments (c_i, g_i) and (f_i, h_i) .

Proof. Assume that we have $\{(c_i, g_i), (f_i, h_i)\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ for some i . We will show how to modify \mathcal{R} into \mathcal{R}' , such that the number of such i decreases, while \mathcal{R}' is still a valid solution of $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$, and $|\mathcal{R}'| \leq |\mathcal{R}|$. Then, by repeating this procedure, we can eventually construct a solution satisfying the property from the Lemma.

To construct \mathcal{R}' , we remove either (c_i, g_i) or (f_i, h_i) from \mathcal{R} , and then add one extra segment to make \mathcal{R}' valid. Recall that the i -th VARIABLE-gadget corresponds to variable x_i in S . As every variable in S is used in exactly 3 clauses, one of the ways of setting x_i (to either **true** or **false**) must satisfy at least 2 clauses. If that setting is $x_i = \text{true}$, then we remove (f_i, h_i) , otherwise we remove (c_i, g_i) . Now, there exists at most one CLAUSE-gadget which needs adjustment to make \mathcal{R}' valid; we do that by adding $(t_{j,1}, v_{j,1})$ to \mathcal{R}' .

TODO: Can we really just remove one segment and add another one? I'd think we need to "restructure" \mathcal{R} around pointsVariable_i (saying one segment due to Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4) and then again restructure \mathcal{R} around the clause that we need to fix? □

Lemma 3.13. 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.

372 *Proof.* Let the clauses in S be $c_1, c_2 \dots c_n$ and the variables be $x_1, x_2 \dots x_n$. Given a solution
 373 \mathcal{R} of the instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$ of geometric set cover, we use Lemma 3.12 to modify \mathcal{R} such that
 374 for any i it contains at most one of (c_i, g_i) and (f_i, h_i) ; this may decrease the cost of \mathcal{R} , but
 375 that does not matter in the subsequent construction. To simplify notation, in the remainder
 376 of this proof we use \mathcal{R} to refer to the modified solution.

377 Given \mathcal{R} , we construct a solution of S by constructing an assignment of variables $\phi :$
 378 $\{x_1, x_2 \dots x_n\} \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$ that satisfies at least $15n - w$ clauses in S .

379 **Variables** Recall that due to Lemma 3.12, \mathcal{R} contains at most one of (c_i, g_i) and (f_i, h_i) .
 We define the value $\phi(x_i)$ for the variable x_i as follows:

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

380 Moreover, from Lemma 3.3 we get $|\text{pointsVariable}_i \cap \mathcal{R}| \geq 3$ for every i .

381 **Clauses** For a clause $C_i = x \vee y \vee z$, \mathcal{R} needs to use at least 11 segments to cover
 382 $\text{pointsClause}_i - \{x, y, z\}$ in CLAUSE-gadget (Lemma 3.9).

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

384 Moreover, if all of the points $\{x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}\}$ are not covered by the segments from $\mathcal{R} \cap \text{pointsVariable}_i$,
 385 then \mathcal{R} needs to cover pointsClause_i with at least 12 segments by Lemma 3.9.

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:

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

386 where a is the number of clauses where none of the points $x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}$ were covered by
 387 $\mathcal{R} \cap \text{segmentsVariable}_j$ for their respective variable x_j .

388 **Satisfied clauses with chosen variable assignment.** Consider a clause, say c_i . If
 389 none of the points $x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}$ in pointsClause_i were covered by segments from $\mathcal{R} \cap \text{segmentsVariable}_j$,
 390 this clause is not satisfied by assignment ϕ .

391 If one of these points is covered by segments from VARIBALE-gadget (TODO better this
 392 or $\mathcal{R} \cap \text{segmentsVariable}_j$), then denote this point as t and say it corresponds to variable x_j .
 393 Consider the cases of choosing value of $\phi(x_j)$ in equation (3.1).

394 If \mathcal{R} contains exactly one of the segments (c_j, g_j) and (f_j, h_j) , then the value $\phi(x_j)$ satisfies
 395 c_i .

396 If \mathcal{R} contains neither (c_j, g_j) nor (f_j, h_j) , then it is impossible that t is covered by segments
 397 in $\mathcal{R} \cap \text{segmentsVariable}_j$.

398 This means that ϕ satisfies all but at most a clauses in S .

399 To conclude, we proved that given a solution of $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$ of size w , we have constructed a
 400 variables assignment ϕ that satisfies at least $n - a$ clauses of S . Finally, note that

$$w \geq 3n + 11(n - a) + 12a = 3n + 11n + a = 14n + a,$$

hence

$$15n - w \leq 15n - 14n - a = n - a.$$

401 So ϕ satisfies at least $15n - w$ clauses of S . □

402 We are ready to conclude the proof of Lemma 3.1.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. By Lemma 3.11, we know that there exists a solution to $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$ of size $15n - k$, so:

$$\text{opt}((\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})) \leq 15n - k.$$

Since the optimum solution of S satisfies k clauses, then according to Lemma 3.13:

$$\text{opt}((\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})) \geq 15n - k.$$

403 Therefore, the solution given by Lemma 3.11 of size $15n - k$ is an optimum solution to the
404 instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$. □

Chapter 4

FPT for Geometric Set Cover for segments with δ -extensions

4.1. 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.

4.1.1. 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 4.1.2

Remark 4.1. *The same algorithm can be used for segments in d directions, where we branch over d directions and it runs in complexity $\mathcal{O}(d^k)$.*

4.1.2. 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 4.1. (*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 4.1. *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 $A \cap \mathcal{C} \not\subseteq B \cap \mathcal{C}$ and $A \cap \mathcal{C} \not\supseteq B \cap \mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. Trivial. □

Lemma 4.2. *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 polynomial time.*

Proof. First we use Lemma 4.1.

Let us enumerate the points from \mathcal{C} that lie on L as x_1, x_2, \dots, 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, \dots, x_k . After using reduction from Lemma 4.1, there are at most k such segments that are distinct. □

We are ready to prove Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1.

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 4.1.

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 4.2; 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 .

473 **Correctness.** Lemma 4.2 proves that at least one segment that we branch over in (1)
 474 must be present in every solution \mathcal{R} with $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$. Therefore, the recursive call can find a
 475 solution, provided there exists one.

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

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

480 **Complexity.** In the leaves of recursion we have $|\mathcal{C}| \leq k^2$, so $|\mathcal{P}| \leq k^4$, because every
 481 segments can be uniquely identified by the two extreme points it covers (by Lemma 4.1).
 482 Therefore, there are $\binom{k^4}{k}$ possible solutions to check, each can be checked in time $O(k|\mathcal{C}|)$.
 483 Therefore, (3) takes time $k^{O(k)}$.

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

487 Reduction from Lemma 4.1 can be implemented in time $O(n^2m)$.

488 It follows that the overall complexity is $O((nm)^2 \cdot k^{O(k)})$ □

489 4.2. FPT for weighted segments with δ -extensions

490 In this section we consider a geometric set cover problem for weighted segments relaxed
 491 with δ -extensions. We show that this problem admits an FPT algorithm when parametrized
 492 with size of solution and δ . Assumption about the problem being relaxed with δ -extensions
 493 is necessary. In the next chapter we show that geometric set cover problem for weighted
 494 segments is W[1]-hard, which means there does not exist an FPT algorithm parametrized by
 495 solution size for it.

496 **Theorem 4.2** (FPT for weighted segment cover with δ -extensions). *There exists an algorithm*
 497 *that given a family \mathcal{P} of n weighted segments (in any direction), a set of m points \mathcal{C} , and*
 498 *parameters k and $\delta > 0$, runs in time $f(k, \delta) \cdot (nm)^c$ for some computable function f and a*
 499 *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*
 500 *determines that such a set \mathcal{R} does not exist.*

501 To solve this problem we will introduce a lemma about choosing a *good* subset of points.
 502 Good subset of points for a set of collinear points C and parameters k and δ is a subset of C ,
 503 such that if we cover it with at most k segments, these segments after δ -extensions will cover
 504 all of the points from C .

505 We will prove that such set of size bounded by some function $f(k, \delta)$ always exists. In
 506 later part of the section Lemma 4.3 will allow us to find a kernel for our original problem.

507 **Definition 4.1.** For a set of collinear points C , a subset $A \subseteq C$ is (k, δ) -**good** if for any set
 508 of segments R that covers A and such that $|R| \leq k$, it holds that $R^{+\delta}$ covers C .

509 **Lemma 4.3.** *For any set of collinear points C , $\delta > 0$ and $k \geq 1$, there exists a (k, δ) -good*
 510 *set $A \subseteq C$ of size at most $(2 + \frac{2}{\delta})^k$. Moreover there exists an algorithm that computes the*
 511 *(k, δ) -good set in time $O(|C| \cdot (2 + \frac{2}{\delta}))$.*

512 To prove this theorem we define *extreme points* for a set of collinear points.

513 **Definition 4.2.** For a set of collinear points C , **extreme points** are the ends of the smallest
 514 segment that covers all points from set C .

515 If C consists of one point or is empty, then there exists 1 or 0 extreme points respectively.

516 *Proof of Lemma 4.3.* We prove this for a fixed δ by induction over k .

517 **Inductive hypothesis.** For any set of collinear points C , there exists a set A such that:

- 518 • A is subset of C ,
- 519 • A is (ℓ, δ) -good for every $1 \leq \ell \leq k$,
- 520 • $|A| \leq (2 + \frac{2}{\delta})^k$,
- 521 • extreme points from C are in A .

522 **Base case for $k = 1$.** It is sufficient that A consists of extreme points of C .

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

525 There are at most 2 extreme points in C and $2 < 2 + \frac{2}{\delta}$.

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

528 Let s be the minimal segment that includes all points from C . That is, the extreme points
529 of C are endpoints of s .

530 We define $M = \lceil 1 + \frac{2}{\delta} \rceil$ subsegments of s in the following way. We split s into M closed
531 segments of equal length. We name these as segments v_i and $|v_i| = \frac{|s|}{M}$ for each $1 \leq i \leq M$.

532 Let C_i be the subset of C consisting of points laying on v_i .

533 Let t_i be the segment with endpoints being the extreme points of C_i . It might be degen-
534 erated segment if C_i consists of one point or empty if C_i is empty.

535 You can see an example of such segments v_i and t_i in Figure 4.1.



Figure 4.1: **Example of segments v_i and t_i .**

Example for $M = 7$ and some set of points (marked with black circles). Upper picture shows segments v_i and lower picture shows segments t_i on the same set of points. a and b are extreme points and therefore segment s ends in a and b . Red segments denote split into M segments of equal length v_i . Blue segments denote segments t_i . t_5 is an empty segment, because there are no points that lie on segment v_5 . Segments t_3 and t_7 are degenerated to one point – c and d respectively. Segments t_1 and t_2 share one point b .

536 We use the inductive hypothesis to choose (k, δ) -good sets A_i for sets C_i . Note that if
537 $|C_i| \leq 1$, then $A_i = C_i$ and it's still a (k, δ) -good set for C_i .

538 Then we define $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^M A_i$. Thus A includes the extreme points of C , because they are
 539 included in the sets A_1 and A_M .

Size of each A_i is at most $(2 + \frac{2}{\delta})^{(k-1)}$ from inductive hypothesis, therefore size of A is at most:

$$M \left(2 + \frac{2}{\delta}\right)^{k-1} = \left\lceil 1 + \frac{2}{\delta} \right\rceil \cdot \left(2 + \frac{2}{\delta}\right)^{k-1} \leq \left(2 + \frac{2}{\delta}\right)^k$$

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

542 For every segment t_i , if there exists a segment x in \mathcal{R} that is disjoint with t_i , then we have
 543 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 ,
 544 then $(\mathcal{R} - \{x\})^{+\delta}$ covers C_i . So $\mathcal{R}^{+\delta}$ covers C_i as well.

545 If there exists a segment t_i for which a segment x as defined above does not exist, then all
 546 $k + 1$ segments that cover A_i intersect with t_i . You can see an example of such segments in
 547 Figure 4.2. Note that there may exist only one such segment t_i . From the inductive hypothesis
 548 endpoints of s are in A_1 and A_M respectively, so \mathcal{R} must cover them. For each endpoint of s ,
 549 there exists a segment that starts in this endpoint and ends somewhere in t_i . Let us call these
 550 two segments y and z . It follows that: $|y| + |z| + |t_i| \geq |s|$. Since $|t_i| \leq |v_i| = \frac{|s|}{M} \leq \frac{|s|}{1 + \frac{2}{\delta}} = \frac{|s|\delta}{\delta + 2}$,
 551 we have $\max(|y|, |z|) \geq |s|(1 - \frac{\delta}{\delta + 2})/2 = \frac{|s|}{\delta + 2}$.




Figure 4.2: **Example of all $k + 1$ segments intersecting with one segment t_i .**
 Both pictures show the same set C (black circles), the same as in Figure 4.1. The upper
 picture shows blue segments t_i for $M = 7$. The lower picture shows green segments – solution
 \mathcal{R} of size 4. All segments from \mathcal{R} intersect with t_4 . Segments z and y are named on the
 picture.

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

$$\max(|y|, |z|)\delta \geq \frac{|s|\delta}{\delta + 2} = \frac{|s|}{1 + \frac{2}{\delta}} \geq \frac{|s|}{M} = v_i \geq t_i.$$

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

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

Algorithm. We can simulate the inductive proof by a recursive algorithm with the
 following complexity:

$$O\left(|C| + \frac{1}{\delta}\right) + O\left(k\left(2 + \frac{1}{\delta}\right)^k\right)$$

Let us now formulate some claims about the properties for the problem parametrized by the solution size. These properties provide bounds for different objects in the problem instance, that help us to find small kernel of the problem or claim that the minimal solution of this instance must be above some threshold.

Definition 4.3. A line in \mathbb{R} is **long** if there are at least $k + 1$ points from \mathcal{C} on it.

Claim 4.1. *If there are more than k different long lines, then \mathcal{C} can not be covered with k segments.*

Proof. We prove the claim by contradiction. Let us assume that we have at least $k + 1$ different long lines in our instance of the problem and solution \mathcal{R} of size at most k covering points \mathcal{C} .

Choose any long line L . Every segment from \mathcal{R} , which is not collinear with L , covers at most one point that lies on L .

L is long, so there are at least $k + 1$ points from \mathcal{C} that lie on L . That implies that there must be a segment in \mathcal{R} that is collinear with L .

Since we have at least $k + 1$ different long lines, then there are at least $k + 1$ segments in \mathcal{R} collinear with different lines. It contradicts with the assumption that $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$. □

Claim 4.2. *If there are 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.*

Proof. We prove the claim by contradiction. Let us assume that we have at least $k^2 + 1$ points from \mathcal{C} that do not lie on any long line, call this set A , and a solution \mathcal{R} of size at most k covering points \mathcal{C} .

For every segment s from \mathcal{R} it covers at most k points from A . It holds because if s covered at least $k + 1$ points from A , then the line in the direction of s would be a long line and that contradicts of definition of A .

If every segment from \mathcal{R} covers at most k points from A and $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$, then at most k^2 points from A are covered by \mathcal{R} and that contradicts the fact that \mathcal{R} is a solution of the given geometric set cover instance. □

We are now ready to give a proof of Theorem 4.2.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Applying the claims 4.1 and 4.2, if we have more than k different long lines or more than k^2 points from \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;
- C_i , points that lie on the i -th long line.

Sets C_i do not need to be disjoint.

Then for every set C_i we can use Lemma 4.3 to obtain a (k, δ) -good set A_i for C_i with $|A_i| \leq (2 + \frac{2}{\delta})^k$.

Then we have a set $\mathcal{C}' = D \cup (\bigcup A_i)$ of size at most $k^2 + k(2 + \frac{2}{\delta})^k$. Observe that if we have a solution \mathcal{R} of size at most k that covers \mathcal{C}' , then $\mathcal{R}^{+\delta}$ covers \mathcal{C} .

\mathcal{C} is separated into several parts – sets D and C_i . Points from D are covered by \mathcal{R} , because D is part of \mathcal{C}' . Each A_i is covered, because A_i is part of \mathcal{C}' ; A_i is a (k, δ) -good set for C_i , therefore $\mathcal{R}^{+\delta}$ covers C_i .

597 After that we shrunk down \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{C}' of size $f(k, \delta)$ for some computable function f . Then
 598 we would like to shrink down \mathcal{P} to some set of relevant segments of bounded size as well.

599 For every pair of points \mathcal{C}' , we can choose one segment from \mathcal{P} that have the lowest weight
 600 among segments that cover these points or decide there is no segment that cover them. Call
 601 this set \mathcal{P}' and name these segments **interesting**. There are at most $|\mathcal{C}'|^2$ different segments
 602 in \mathcal{P}' .

603 We need to show that when we cover \mathcal{C}' with segments from \mathcal{P}' we achieve the same
 604 minimal solution as when we cover them with segments from \mathcal{P} . In order to prove this,
 605 consider a minimal solution \mathcal{R} that covers \mathcal{C}' with segments from \mathcal{P}' and take any segment s
 606 from \mathcal{R} . Let us look at the points from \mathcal{C}' that lie on s and call this set of points F . F is
 607 a set of collinear points for course. We can cover F with any segment that covers extreme
 608 points of F , because all other points lay on the segment between these points. Therefore we
 609 can change s to an interesting segment s' and interesting segments are defined in such a way,
 610 that s' has weight no larger than weight of s .

611 This has complexity $O(|\mathcal{C}'|^2|\mathcal{P}|)$ and produces shrunk down set of segments \mathcal{P}' of size
 612 $f(k, \delta)$ for some computable function f .

613 Then we can iterate over all subsets of \mathcal{P}' and choose the set with the lowest sum of
 614 weights that cover \mathcal{C}' . This solution would have weight not larger than optimal solution for
 615 the problem without extension, because we iterate over all possibilities of covering the subset
 616 of \mathcal{C}' . □

Chapter 5

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

In this chapter we consider geometric set cover problem with weighted segment. Theorem 5.1 proves that this problem is W[1]-hard when parametrized by the size of the solution. We additionally restrict problem to only use segments in three directions to achieve a stronger result. W[1]-hardness is proved by reduction to a grid tiling problem, which was introduced in [Cygan et al., 2015].

Definition 5.1. Line is **right-diagonal** if it is described by linear function $y = x + d$ for any $d \in \mathbb{R}$. Segment is **right-diagonal** if its direction is a right-diagonal line.

Theorem 5.1. *Consider the problem of covering a set \mathcal{C} of points by selecting at most k segments from a set of segments \mathcal{P} with non-negative weights $w : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^*$ so that the weight of the cover is minimal. Then this problem is W[1]-hard parametrized by k and 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 . Moreover, this holds even if all segments in \mathcal{P} are axis-parallel or right-diagonal.*

Theorem 5.1 is also true for less restricted problem where segments have any direction. We prove more tight setting in this section.

In order to prove Theorem 5.1 we will show reduction from a W[1]-hard problem. We introduce grid tiling problem, which is proven to be W[1]-complete in literature.

Definition 5.2. We define **powerset** of some set A , denoted as $\text{Pow}(A)$, as a set of all subsets of A .

Definition 5.3. In the **grid tiling** problem we are given integers n and k , and a function $f : \{1 \dots k\} \times \{1 \dots k\} \rightarrow \text{Pow}(\{1 \dots n\} \times \{1 \dots n\})$ specifying the set of allowed tiles for each cell of a $k \times k$ grid. The task is to find functions $x, y : \{1 \dots k\} \rightarrow \{1 \dots n\}$ that assign numbers from $\{1 \dots n\}$ to respectively columns and rows of the grid, so that $(x(i), y(j)) \in f(i, j)$ for all valid i and j , or conclude that such an assignment does not exist.

The next theorem is describing complexity of grid tiling problem.

Theorem 5.2. *Grid tiling is W[1]-hard parametrized by k and assuming ETH, there is no $f(k) \cdot n^{o(\sqrt{k})}$ -time algorithm solving this problem for any computable function f .*

647 This theorem is proved in [Cygan et al., 2015], page 490.

648 The reminder of this section is proving Theorem 5.1 by reduction of grid tiling problem
 649 to geometric set cover. That would prove that geometric set cover is W[1]-hard, because if
 650 we could solve it with an FPT algorithm, then we could also solve grid tiling problem (which
 651 we reduced to geometric set cover). Therefore geometric set cover with setting described in
 652 Theorem 5.1 is at least as hard as grid tiling problem.

653 We start with an instance of the grid tiling problem (n, k, f) size of the grid k , number of
 654 colors n and function of allowed tiles $f : \{1 \dots k\} \times \{1 \dots k\} \rightarrow \mathbf{Pow}\{1 \dots n\} \times \{1 \dots n\}$.

655 TODO: nice picture of instance of grid tiling with solution

656 **Construction.** We construct an instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w)$ of geometric set cover as follows.

657 First let us choose any bijection $order : \{1, \dots, n^2\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, n\}$.

658 Define $match_v(i, j)$ and $match_h(i, j)$ as functions denoting whether two points share x or
 659 y coordinate.

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

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

Points. Define points:

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

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

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 us define $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2k^2}$. For a point $p = \{x, y\}$ we define points:

$$p^L = \{x - \epsilon, y\},$$

$$p^R = \{x + \epsilon, y\},$$

$$p^U = \{x, y + \epsilon\},$$

$$p^D = \{x, y - \epsilon\}.$$

Then we define:

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

660 **Segments.** Define horizontal segments.

$$\text{hor}_{i,j,t_1,t_2} = (h_{i,j,t_1}^R, h_{i+1,j,t_2}^L)$$

$$\text{ver}_{i,j,t_1,t_2} = (v_{i,j,t_1}^U, v_{i,j+1,t_2}^D)$$

$$\text{horBeg}_{i,t} = (h_{1,i,1}^L, h_{1,i,t}^L)$$

$$\text{horEnd}_{i,t} = (h_{k,i,t}^R, h_{k,i,n^2}^R)$$

$$\text{verBeg}_{i,t} = (v_{i,1,1}^D, v_{i,1,t}^D)$$

$$\text{verEnd}_{i,t} = (v_{i,k,t}^U, v_{i,k,n^2}^U)$$

661 Next we define sets of vertical and horizontal segments:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{HOR} &= \{ \text{hor}_{i,j,t_1,t_2} : 1 \leq i < k, 1 \leq j \leq k, 1 \leq t_1, t_2 \leq n^2, \text{match}_h(t_1, t_2) \text{ holds} \} \\ &\cup \{ \text{horBeg}_{i,t} : 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq t \leq n^2 \} \\ &\cup \{ \text{horEnd}_{i,t} : 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq t \leq n^2 \} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{VER} &= \{ \text{ver}_{i,j,t_1,t_2} : 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j < k, 1 \leq t_1, t_2 \leq n^2, \text{match}_v(t_1, t_2) \} \\ &\cup \{ \text{verBeg}_{i,t} : 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq t \leq n^2 \} \\ &\cup \{ \text{verEnd}_{i,t} : 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq t \leq n^2 \} \end{aligned}$$

Finally we also define set of right-diagonal segments:

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

662 TODO: explain that these segments are in fact diagonal

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

663 The weight of each segment in $\text{HOR} \cup \text{VER}$, while every segment in DIAG has weight
664 $\delta = \frac{1}{4k^4}$.

665 TODO: Put a picture of small instance like 3x3 with n=2

$$w(s) = \begin{cases} \text{length}(s) & \text{if } s \in \text{HOR} \cup \text{VER} \\ \delta & \text{if } s \in \text{DIAG} \end{cases}$$

666 **Lemma 5.1.** *If there exists a solution for the grid tiling instance $f_{i,j}$, then there exists a*
667 *solution for the instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w)$ of geometric set cover with weight $2k^2(n^2 + 1) - 4k^2\epsilon -$*
668 *$4k(1 - \epsilon) + k^2\delta$.*

Proof. Suppose there exists a solution x, y to the grid tiling problem. Then consider a solution that covers all points

$$\{h_{i,j,t} : 1 \leq i, j \leq k, \text{order}(t) = (x(i), y(j))\} \cup \{v_{i,j,t} : 1 \leq i, j \leq k, \text{order}(t) = (x(i), y(j))\}$$

669 with k^2 segments from DIAG and the rest in VER or HOR . This solution has weight
670 $2k^2(n^2 + 1) - 4k^2\epsilon - 4k(1 - \epsilon) + k^2\delta$. \square

Claim 5.1. Points in $\{p^L : p \in H\} \cup \{p^R : p \in H\}$ have to be covered with segments from HOR.

Points in $\{p^U : p \in V\} \cup \{p^D : p \in V\}$ have to be covered with segments from VER.

Claim 5.2. For given $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ and any solution of an instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w)$ no two points h_{i,j,t_1}, h_{i,j,t_2} (v_{i,j,t_1}, v_{i,j,t_2}) for $1 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq n^2$ can be not covered with segments from HOR (VER).

Proof. Proof for horizontal segments. Proof for vertical is analogous.

Assume point h_{i,j,t_1} is not covered with segments from HOR. Point h_{i,j,t_1}^R has to be covered with HOR from Claim 5.1. And every segment in HOR covering h_{i,j,t_1}^R , but not h_{i,j,t_1} covers also h_{i,j,t_2} . \square

Lemma 5.2. For a constructed instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w)$ any solution has to have sum of weights from sets HOR and VER at least $W_{hv} = 2k^2(n^2 + 1) - 4k^2\epsilon - 4k(1 - \epsilon)$.

Proof. We know that for every $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ only one there exists only one t_x and t_y such that v_{i,j,t_x} and h_{i,j,t_y} can be not covered by segments from HOR and VER (Claim 5.2),

We sum the lower bound for sum of length for horizontal/vertical lines for a single vertical line (the bound is the same for every horizontal line).

Let us fix $1 \leq i \leq k$.

(1) Length between $v_{i,1,1}^D$ and v_{i,k,n^2}^U is:

$$(k(n^2 + 1) + n^2 + \epsilon) - ((n^2 + 1) + 1 - \epsilon) = k(n^2 + 1) - 2(1 - \epsilon).$$

(2) For every $1 \leq j \leq k$ there exists at most one $1 \leq t \leq n^2$ such that $v_{i,j,t}$ is not covered by segments from VER (Claim 5.2). Its guards $v_{i,j,t}^U$ and $v_{i,j,t}^D$ have to be covered in VER (Claim 5.1). Therefore at most k spaces of length 2ϵ can be left not covered by segments from VER.

Therefore sum of these lower bounds for vertical and horizontal lines are:

$$2k(k(n^2 + 1) - 2k\epsilon - 2(1 - \epsilon)) = 2k^2(n^2 + 1) - 4k^2\epsilon - 4k(1 - \epsilon)$$

Lemma 5.3. For a constructed instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w)$ for any solution \mathcal{R} with weight equal to $2k^2(n^2 + 1) - 4k^2\epsilon - 4k(1 - \epsilon) + k^2\delta$, for every $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ there exists such $1 \leq t \leq n^2$ that:

(1) $v_{i,j,t}, h_{i,j,t}$ are not covered by segments from VER or HOR;

(2) segment $(v_{i,j,t}, h_{i,j,t})$ is in solution \mathcal{R} ;

(3) $order(t) \in f(i, j)$, ie. it is an allowed tile for (i, j) ;

(4) for every $1 \leq s \leq n^2$, $s \neq t$, $v_{i,j,s}$ is covered in VER;

(5) for every $1 \leq s \leq n^2$, $s \neq t$, $h_{i,j,s}$ is covered in HOR.

Name the function of this t as diagonal : $\{1 \dots k\} \times \{1 \dots k\} \rightarrow \{1 \dots n^2\}$.

701 *Proof.* At most one h_{i,j,t_x} and v_{i,j,t_y} points are covered with DIAG (Claim 5.2).

Exactly one h_{i,j,t_x} and v_{i,j,t_y} points are covered with DIAG, because if one of them were not, then we would use too much weight

$$W_{hv} + 2\epsilon > 2k^2(n^2 + 1) - 4k^2\epsilon - 4k(1 - \epsilon) + k^2\delta$$

702 This points are covered with the same segment from DIAG, because we need to use at
 703 least k^2 of them to use exactly one DIAG segment for every pair of $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, if we used 2
 704 segments from DIAG for one pair (i, j) , then we would have used too much weight by δ . Since
 705 these points h_{i,j,t_x} and v_{i,j,t_y} are covered by segment from DIAG, therefore $t_x = t_y$.

706 Therefore $diagonal(i, j) = t_x = t_y$ and $order(t_x)$ is an allowed tile for (i, j) because the
 707 respective segment is in DIAG.

708 □

709 **Lemma 5.4.** *For a constructed instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w)$ for any solution of weight $2k^2(n^2 + 1) -$
 710 $4k^2\epsilon - 4k(1 - \epsilon) + k^2\delta$ it holds that diagonal function from Lemma 5.3:*

- 711 1. for any $1 \leq i < k, 1 \leq j \leq k$, $match_h(diagonal(i, j), diagonal(i + 1, j))$ must be true;
- 712 2. for any $1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j < k$, $match_v(diagonal(i, j), diagonal(i, j + 1))$ must be true.

713 *Proof.* Every space between points in H and V covered by HOR/VER has to be covered by
 714 only one segment, because otherwise it would use $W_{hv} + \epsilon > 2k^2(n^2 + 1) - 4k^2\epsilon - 4k(1 - \epsilon) + k^2\delta$,
 715 therefore such solution would be too costly.

716 Proof for vertical (2), proof for horizontal is analogous.

717 Let us take any $1 \leq i < k, 1 \leq j \leq k$ and name $t_1 = diagonal(i, j)$ and $t_2 = diagonal(i +$
 718 $1, j)$. Therefore h_{i,j,t_1} and h_{i+1,j,t_2} are not covered by segments from HOR, h_{i,j,t_1}^R and h_{i+1,j,t_2}^L
 719 have to be covered by segments from HOR (Claim 5.1). Every segment from HOR starts
 720 at h_{x,y,z_1}^R segment and finishes at $h_{x,y+1,z_2}^L$ segment for some $1 \leq x \leq k, 1 \leq z < k$ and
 721 $1 \leq z_1, z_2 \leq n^2$. Since all of the points between h_{i,j,t_1}^R and h_{i+1,j,t_2}^L are covered by segments
 722 in HOR, and there are two different segments covering these points, one of them must begin
 723 at h_{i,j,t_1}^R and end at $h_{i,j+1,z_2}^L$ and the other one begin at h_{i,j,z_1}^R and end at h_{i+1,j,t_2}^L for some
 724 $1 \leq z_1, z_2 \leq n^2$. Therefore space between h_{i,j,z_1}^R and $h_{i,j+1,z_2}^L$ is covered twice and is longer
 725 than ϵ . By Lemma 5.2 lower bound for weight of such solution is $W_{hv} + \epsilon$ which contradicts
 726 that the given solution has size $2k^2(n^2 + 1) - 4k^2\epsilon - 4k(1 - \epsilon) + k^2\delta < W_{hv} + \epsilon$ Therefore
 727 h_{i,j,t_1}^R and h_{i+1,j,t_2}^L must be covered by one segment from HOR and these points are ends of
 728 this segment.

729 h_{i,j,t_1}^R and h_{i+1,j,t_2}^L are ends of a segment from HOR, therefore $match_h(t_1, t_2)$ must be
 730 true. □

731 **Corollary 5.1.** *For a constructed instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w)$ for any solution of weight $2k^2(n^2 + 1) -$
 732 $4k^2\epsilon - 4k(1 - \epsilon) + k^2\delta$ it holds that diagonal function from Lemma 5.3:*

- 733 1. for any $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, $match_h(diagonal(1, j), diagonal(i, j))$ must be true;
- 734 2. for any $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, $match_v(diagonal(i, 1), diagonal(i, j))$ must be true.

735 *Proof.* Simple inductive proof based on Lemma 5.4. □

736 **Lemma 5.5.** *If there exists solution of instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w)$ with weight at most $2k^2(n^2 + 1) -$
 737 $4k^2\epsilon - 4k(1 - \epsilon) + k^2\delta$, then there exists a solution for grid tiling instance.*

738 *Proof.* Take *diagonal* function from Lemma 5.3.

739 To define x function for every $1 \leq i \leq k$ as $x(i) = x_i$ where $(x_i, a) = \text{order}(v_{i,1})$ and y
740 function for every $1 \leq i \leq k$ as $y(i) = y_i$ where $(b, y_i) = \text{order}(h_{1,i})$

741 To prove that it is a correct solution for grid tiling, we need to prove that for every
742 $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ $(x(i), y(j))$ is in allowed tiles set $f(i, j)$.

743 Let us take any $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, By Corollary 5.1 we know that $\text{match}_h(\text{diagonal}(1, j), \text{diagonal}(i, j))$
744 and $\text{match}_v(\text{diagonal}(i, 1), \text{diagonal}(i, j))$ are true. Therefore $\text{order}(\text{diagonal}(i, j)) = (x(i), y(i))$.
745 By Lemma 5.3 we know that $\text{order}(\text{diagonal}(i, j))$ is in $f(i, j)$. Therefore $(x(i), y(i))$ is in
746 $f(i, j)$. □

748 *Proof of Theorem 5.1.* Based on Lemmas 5.1 and 5.5 this is true. □

Chapter 6

Geometric Set Cover with lines

6.1. 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)

6.2. 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.

6.3. 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 is also APX-complete.

6.4. 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.

Unfortunately I haven't done this :(

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

6.5. 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.

803 Chapter 7

804 Geometric Set Cover with polygons

805 7.1. State of the art

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

808 Although with thin objects, even if we allow δ -expansion, the Set Cover with rectangles is
809 APX-complete (for $\delta = 1/2$), it follows from APX-completeness for segments with δ -expansion
810 in Section 3.1.

811 Covering points with squares is W[1]-hard [Marx, 2005]. It can be proven that assuming
812 *SETH*, there is no $f(k) \cdot (|\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{P}|)^{k-\epsilon}$ time algorithm for any computable function f and
813 $\epsilon > 0$ that decides if there are k polygons in \mathcal{P} that together cover \mathcal{C} , *Theorem 1.9* in [Marx
814 and Pilipczuk, 2015].

815 Chapter 8

816 Conclusions

817 We do not know FPT for axis-parallel segments without δ -extensions.

818 Bibliography

- 819 [Cygan et al., 2015] Cygan, M., Fomin, F. V., Kowalik, L., Lokshtanov, D., Marx, D.,
820 Pilipczuk, M., Pilipczuk, M., and Saurabh, S. (2015). *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer.
- 821 [Har-Peled and Lee, 2009] Har-Peled, S. and Lee, M. (2009). Weighted geometric set cover
822 problems revisited. *Journal of Computational Geometry*, 3.
- 823 [Håstad, 2001] Håstad, J. (2001). Some optimal inapproximability results. *J. ACM*,
824 48(4):798–859.
- 825 [Li and Jin, 2015] Li, J. and Jin, Y. (2015). A PTAS for the weighted unit disk cover problem.
826 *CoRR*, abs/1502.04918.
- 827 [Marx, 2005] Marx, D. (2005). Efficient approximation schemes for geometric problems? In
828 Brodal, G. S. and Leonardi, S., editors, *Algorithms – ESA 2005*, pages 448–459, Berlin,
829 Heidelberg. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- 830 [Marx and Pilipczuk, 2015] Marx, D. and Pilipczuk, M. (2015). Optimal parameterized algo-
831 rithms for planar facility location problems using voronoi diagrams. *CoRR*, abs/1504.05476.