

1

University of Warsaw

2

Faculty of Mathematics, Informatics and Mechanics

3

Katarzyna Kowalska

Student no. 371053

4

# Approximation and Parameterized Algorithms for Segment Set Cover

5

6

Master's thesis

7

in COMPUTER SCIENCE

8

Supervisor:

**dr Michał Pilipczuk**

Institute of Informatics

9

June 2022

**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 blabalysis

35

## **Tytuł pracy w języku polskim**

36 Algorytmy aproksymacyjne i parametryzowane dla problemu pokrywania punktów  
37 odcinkami na płaszczyźnie



# Contents

39	<b>1. Introduction</b>	5
40	<b>2. Preliminaries</b>	9
41	2.1. Geometric set cover	9
42	2.2. Parameterization	9
43	2.3. Approximation	10
44	2.4. $\delta$ -extension	10
45	2.5. Weighted Geometric Set Cover	11
46	<b>3. APX-hardness of geometric set cover</b>	13
47	3.1. MAX-(3,3)-SAT and statement of reduction	13
48	3.2. Reduction	15
49	3.2.1. VARIABLE-gadget	15
50	3.2.2. OR-gadget	16
51	3.2.3. CLAUSE-gadget	18
52	3.2.4. Summary	20
53	3.2.5. Summary of construction	21
54	3.3. Construction lemmas and proof of Lemma 3.1	22
55	<b>4. Fixed-parameter tractable algorithm for geometric set cover problem</b>	25
56	4.1. Fixed-parameter tractable algorithm for unweighted segments	25
57	4.1.1. Axis-parallel segments	25
58	4.1.2. Segments in arbitrary directions	26
59	4.2. Fixed-parameter tractable algorithm for weighted segments with $\delta$ -extension	28
60	<b>5. W[1]-hardness for axis-parallel weighted segments</b>	33
61	5.1. Grid Tiling	33
62	5.2. Statement of reduction	34
63	5.3. Construction of Geometric Set Cover instance	35
64	5.3.1. Points	36
65	5.3.2. Segments	36
66	5.4. Proof that reduction is correct	37



# Chapter 1

## Introduction

Some problems in Computer Science are known to be NP-complete, meaning that assuming  $P \neq NP$  there is no polynomial time algorithm that can solve these problems. Even so, they still can be amenable to different approaches, such as approximation or parametrization.

**Definition 1.1.** In the **Set Cover** problem we are given a set of elements (universe)  $\mathcal{C}$  and a family of sets  $\mathcal{P}$  that are subsets of the universe  $\mathcal{C}$  and sum up to the whole  $\mathcal{C}$ . Our task is to find a set  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  such that  $\bigcup \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{C}$  and the size of  $\mathcal{R}$  is minimum possible.

Set Cover is a classical example of an NP-complete problem, which has been proven in the literature to be inapproximable with factor  $(1 - o(1)) \ln n$  assuming  $P \neq NP$  (which is a stronger result than APX-hardness) proved in [Dinur and Steurer, 2014], and W[2]-hard with the natural parametrization. However restricting the problem to various specialized settings can lead to more tractable special cases. In this thesis we take a closer look at the Geometric Set Cover problem in the plane, where elements to cover are points in the plane and sets to cover them with are geometric objects.

**Approximation** Over the years there has been a lot of work related to approximation algorithms for Geometric Set Cover. Notably, Geometric Set Cover with unweighted unit disks admits a PTAS (see Corollary 1.1 in [Mustafa and Ray, 2010]). When we consider the same problem with weighted unit disks (or unit squares), the problem admits a QPTAS [Mustafa et al., 2014], see also [Pilipczuk et al., 2020]. On the other hand, [Chan and Grant, 2014] proves that Geometric Set Cover with unweighted axis-parallel rectangles is APX-hard; they also show similar hardness for Geometric Set Cover with many other standard geometric objects.

**Parametrization** We consider Geometric Set Cover parameterized by the size of solution. Geometric Set Cover with unit squares was first proven to be W[1]-hard in [Marx, 2005] (Theorem 5). A later follow-up work [Marx and Pilipczuk, 2015] shows that there is an algorithm running in time  $n^{\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k})}$  that solves Geometric Set Cover with unit squares or disks and that there is no algorithm running in time  $f(k) \cdot n^{o(\sqrt{k})}$  for any computable  $f$  under the Exponential-Time Hypothesis, so this is a tight bound for this problem.

We also consider parametrization of weighted problems. There does not seem to be a consensus of what parametrization in the weighted setting is exactly; there was an attempt to introduce a quite complicated general framework of weighted parameterized setting in [Shachnai and Zehavi, 2017]. Kernels for several well-known weighted problems such as Subset

Sum or Knapsack are presented in [Etscheid et al., 2017]. Another work [Kim et al., 2021] considers weighted parametrization of Weighted Directed Feedback Set and Weighted *st*-Cut.

**$\delta$ -extension** In this paper, we focus on Geometric Set Cover with segments with  $\delta$ -extension.  $\delta$ -extension is a problem relaxation method based on the  $\delta$ -shrinking model which was introduced in [Adamaszek et al., 2015] to provide an interesting result for the Maximum Weight Independent Set of Rectangles problem. In this problem one needs to find a set of non-overlapping weighted rectangles with maximum sum of weight possible. In the  $\delta$ -shrinking relaxed problem the returned set of rectangles must be non-overlapping after all the rectangles are shrunk by a tiny fraction  $\delta$  towards the centre of symmetry on all sides. This problem is easier, because we compare this result to the optimum result before the shrinking. It might even lead to finding a set with result better than the optimum for the original problem. The author in [Adamaszek et al., 2015] presents a PTAS for Maximum Weight Independent Set of Rectangles with  $\delta$ -shrinking, which is later improved to EPTAS in [Pilipczuk et al., 2016] alongside presenting a new FPT result for this problem with natural parametrization. Later the similar  $\delta$ -shrinking model was used in [Wiese, 2018] to present a PTAS for Maximum Weight Independent Set of Polygons with  $\delta$ -shrinking.

**Definition 1.2.** For any  $\delta > 0$  and a centre-symmetric convex object  $L$  with centre of symmetry  $S = (x_s, y_s)$ , the  $\delta$ -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 centred at  $S$  with scale  $(1 + \delta)$ .

Analogous to  $\delta$ -shrinking,  $\delta$ -extension provides a framework of relaxing Geometric Set Cover problems, where we allow the returned set of objects  $\mathcal{R}$  to *almost* cover the points in the universe by requiring that  $\mathcal{R}$  covers all the points in the universe  $\mathcal{C}$  after  $\delta$ -extension, ie. by set  $\mathcal{R}^{+\delta}$ . The same concept could be used for Geometric Set Hitting problems.

For more elaborate discussion of this concept see Section 2.4.

Similar model is used to prove that Geometric Set Cover with fat polygons relaxed with  $\delta$ -extension admits EPTAS [Har-Peled and Lee, 2009].  $\delta$ -extension model presented there is well-defined only for fat polygons. It extends the object by all the points that have distance to the closest point in the object  $P$  no larger than  $\delta \cdot \text{rad}(P)$ , where  $\text{rad}(P)$  is a radius of a circle inscribed into  $P$ . Since segments do not have any circle inscribed into them, the definition presented there cannot be utilized for this problem. Polygons extended by  $\delta$ -extension defined in 1.2 covers a superset of set of points that object extended by  $\delta$ -extension defined in [Har-Peled and Lee, 2009]. Since our definition is more permissive for any polygon, then EPTAS from [Har-Peled and Lee, 2009] also works for polygons extended by our  $\delta$ -extension.

## Our contribution

In this paper we make the following contributions.

We show that approximation of unweighted Geometric Set Cover with axis-parallel segments (even if we relax the problem with  $\frac{1}{2}$ -extension) is APX-hard (Theorem 1.1).

**Theorem 1.1. (*Axis-parallel segment set cover with  $\frac{1}{2}$ -extension is APX-hard*).** *Unweighted geometric set cover with axis-parallel segments in the 2D plane is APX-hard (even with  $\frac{1}{2}$ -extension). That is, assuming  $P \neq NP$ , there does not exist a PTAS for this problem.*

This expands the previous result of [Chan and Grant, 2014] that Geometric Set Cover with unweighted axis-parallel rectangles being APX-hard. This also proves that the assumption in



143 [Har-Peled and Lee, 2009] for EPTAS about polygons being fat is necessary, because cover  
144 with arbitrary polygons with  $\delta$ -extension is APX-hard.

145 We also provide two FPT algorithms for parameterized Geometric Set Cover with un-  
146 weighted segments (Theorem 1.2) and weighted segments relaxed with  $\delta$ -extension (Theo-  
147 rem 1.3).

148 **Theorem 1.2. (FPT for segment cover).** *There exists an algorithm that given a fam-  
149 ily  $\mathcal{P}$  of segments (in any direction), a set of points  $\mathcal{C}$  and a parameter  $k$ , runs in time  
150  $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}(|\mathcal{C}| \cdot |\mathcal{P}|)^2$ , and outputs a solution  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  such that  $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  covers all points  
151 in  $\mathcal{C}$ , or determines that such a set  $\mathcal{R}$  does not exist.*

152 **Theorem 1.3. (FPT for weighted segment cover with  $\delta$ -extension).** *There exists an  
153 algorithm that given a family  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $n$  weighted segments (in any direction), a set of  $m$  points  
154  $\mathcal{C}$ , and parameters  $k$  and  $\delta > 0$ , runs in time  $f(k, \delta) \cdot (nm)^c$  for some computable function  $f$   
155 and a constant  $c$  and outputs a set  $\mathcal{R}$  such that:*

- 156 •  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ ,
- 157 •  $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$ ,
- 158 •  $\mathcal{R}^{+\delta}$  covers all points in  $\mathcal{C}$ ,
- 159 • the weight of  $\mathcal{R}$  is not greater than the weight of an optimum solution of size at most  $k$   
160 for this problem without  $\delta$ -extension,

161 or determines that there is no set  $\mathcal{R}$  with  $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$  such that  $\mathcal{R}$  covers all points in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

162 On the other hand, we prove that Geometric Set Cover with weighted axis-parallel seg-  
163 ments is W[1]-hard (Theorem 1.4) and assuming ETH there does not exist algorithm for this  
164 problem that runs in time  $f(k)(|\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{P}|)^{o(\sqrt{k})}$ . See Figure 1.1 for a summary of parameterized  
165 results for the weighted setting.

166 **Theorem 1.4.** *Consider the problem of covering a set  $\mathcal{C}$  of points by selecting at most  $k$   
167 segments from a set of segments  $\mathcal{P}$  with non-negative weights  $w : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  so that the weight  
168 of the cover is minimal. Then this problem is W[1]-hard when parameterized by  $k$  and assuming  
169 ETH, there is no algorithm for this problem with running time  $f(k) \cdot (|\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{P}|)^{o(\sqrt{k})}$  for any  
170 computable function  $f$ . Moreover, this holds even if all segments in  $\mathcal{P}$  are axis-parallel or  
171 right-diagonal.*

172 Please see Section 2.1 for exact definitions of axis-parallel and right-diagonal segments.

173 This result is particularly interesting, because problem without weights is FPT and  
174 weighted problem is W[1]-hard. Moreover  $\delta$ -extension allowed us to provide an FPT algorithm  
175 for a problem, which is W[1]-hard otherwise.

176 Not that the result of theorem 1.4 is not tight: there exists a simple algorithm running in  
177 time  $\mathcal{O}(f(k)(|\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{P}|)^k)$ . So the question whether there exists an algorithm for this problem  
178 running in time  $f(k) \cdot (|\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{P}|)^{o(k)}$  is still open.

179 Permissive FPT is a relaxed FPT problem, where we need to find solution of *any* size in  
180 FPT-time, but we compare it to the optimum solution of size at most  $k$ . Idea for permissive  
181 FPT in local search was presented in [Marx and Schlotter, 2011], [Gaspers et al., 2012].

182 Theorem 1.4 can be improved to show that a permissive FPT algorithm does not exist.  
183 This is formulated precisely in 5.2.

	exact	$\delta$ -extension
axis-parallel	?	FPT*
3 directions	W[1]-hard	FPT*
any direction	W[1]-hard*	FPT

Figure 1.1: Our results for Geometric Set Cover problem with weighted segments parameterized by the size of solution. Results marked with \* trivially follow from the results presented in this thesis.

184 **Future work.** There are two aforementioned problems that relate to Theorem 1.4 and were  
185 not solved in this thesis. We have not presented W[1]-hardness proof of Geometric Set Cover  
186 problem with axis-parallel weighted segments, but this construction maybe might be improved  
187 to utilize segments in 2 directions instead of 3 directions. The other question is what is the  
188 tight bound for this problem. The simple algorithm solving this problem is running in time  
189  $\mathcal{O}(f(k)(|\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{P}|)^k)$ .

## Chapter 2

## Preliminaries

In this chapter we present some basic definitions that will be used later.

### 2.1. Geometric set cover

Whenever speaking about geometric set cover, we consider it in the 2-dimensional plane.

In the geometric set cover problem we are given  $\mathcal{P}$  — a set of objects, which are connected subsets of the plane and  $\mathcal{C}$  — 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 object from  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $|\mathcal{R}|$  is minimized. We will mostly consider the case where  $\mathcal{P}$  consists of segments in the plane.

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

**Definition 2.1.** Segment is **axis-parallel** if it lies on line that is either horizontal  $x = c$  or vertical  $y = c$ .

**Definition 2.2.** A line is **right-diagonal** if it is described by linear function  $x + y = d$  for some  $d \in \mathbb{R}$ . Segment is **right-diagonal** if its direction is a right-diagonal line.

**Definition 2.3.** **Segment Set Cover** is a Geometric Set Cover, where objects that we cover the points with are segments.

### 2.2. Parameterization

In the parameterized setting of the Geometric Set Cover for a given  $k$ , our task is to either find a solution  $\mathcal{R}$  such that  $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$  or decide that there is no such solution.

**Definition 2.4.** A **Fixed-parameter Tractable (FPT)** algorithm for a problem with parameter  $k$  and instance size  $n$  is an algorithm running in time  $f(k) \cdot n^c$  for some constant  $c$  and some computable function  $f$ .

**Definition 2.5.** Boolean formula is in **conjunctive normal form (CNF)** if it is a conjunction of one or more formulas, which are disjunction of literals.  **$k$ -CNF** formula is a CNF formula, where every disjunction consists of at most  $k$  literals.

**Definition 2.6.**  **$k$ -SAT** problem is a boolean satisfiability problem of  $k$ -CNF formulas. Given  $k$ -CNF formula, one must answer if there exists any variables assignment that satisfies the formula.

**Definition 2.7.** For  $k \geq 3$  set us define  $S_k$  as a set of constants  $\sigma$  such that there exists an algorithm solving  $k$ -SAT running in time  $\mathcal{O}^*(2^{\sigma n})$ . Set us define  $s_k$  as the infimum of the set  $S_k$ .

**Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH)** is a conjecture that  $s_3 > 0$ . This conjecture implies that there does not exist an algorithm solving 3-SAT running in time  $2^{o(n)}$ .

We provide the main theorem that we use in this thesis for W[1]-hard problems. To see the definition of a W[1]-hard problem, see Chapter 13.3 of [Cygan et al., 2015].

**Theorem 2.1.** *Problem parameterized by  $k$  is **W[1]-hard** if assuming ETH there does no algorithm solving this problem running in time  $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k)}$ .*

## 2.3. Approximation

Let us recall some definitions related to optimization problems.

**Definition 2.8.** A **polynomial-time approximation scheme (PTAS)** for a minimization problem  $\Pi$  is a family of algorithms  $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$  for every  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$  takes an instance  $I$  of  $\Pi$  and in polynomial time finds a solution that is within a factor of  $(1 + \epsilon)$  of being optimal. This means that the reported solution has weight at most  $(1 + \epsilon)\text{opt}(I)$ , where  $\text{opt}(I)$  is the weight of an optimal solution to  $I$ .

**Definition 2.9.** A problem  $\Pi$  is **APX-hard** if assuming  $P \neq NP$ , there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that there is no polynomial-time  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for  $\Pi$ .

## 2.4. $\delta$ -extension

Another idea presented here, which can be utilized only when considering the problems with geometric objects, is  $\delta$ -extension. We define it specifically for the geometric set cover problem with convex centre-symmetric objects.

Intuitively, we consider a problem with slightly larger objects, which makes the instance more permissive. However, we aim to find a solution that is not larger than the optimum solution to the original problem, so this is substantially easier than just solving the problem for the larger objects. It may even be the case that we are able to find a solution of size smaller than the optimum solution to the original problem.

Formal definition of  $\delta$ -extended objects. is present in Definition 1.2.

The geometric set cover problem with  $\delta$ -extension is a version of geometric set cover with the following modifications.

- We need to cover all the points in  $\mathcal{C}$  by selecting objects from  $\{P^{+\delta} : P \in \mathcal{P}\}$  (which always include no fewer points than the objects before  $\delta$ -extension).
- We look for a solution that is not larger than the optimum solution to the original problem. Note that it does not need to be an optimal solution in the modified problem.

Formally, we have the following.

**Definition 2.10.** The **geometric set cover problem with  $\delta$ -extension** is the problem where for an input instance  $I = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C})$  of geometric set cover, the task is to output a solution  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  such that the  $\delta$ -extended set  $\{R^{+\delta} : R \in \mathcal{R}\}$  covers  $\mathcal{C}$  and is not larger than the optimal solution to the problem without extension, i.e.  $|\mathcal{R}| \leq |\text{opt}(I)|$ .

At last, we formulate a definition of the polynomial-time approximation scheme (PTAS) for a problem with  $\delta$ -extension.

**Definition 2.11.** A **PTAS for geometric set cover with  $\delta$ -extension** is a family of algorithms  $\{\mathcal{A}_{\delta,\epsilon}\}_{\delta,\epsilon>0}$  that each takes as an input instance  $I = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C})$  of geometric set cover where objects are centre-symmetric and strongly convex, and in polynomial-time outputs a solution  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  such that the  $\delta$ -extended set  $\{R^{+\delta} : R \in \mathcal{R}\}$  covers  $\mathcal{C}$  and is within a  $(1 + \epsilon)$  factor of the optimal solution to this problem without extension, i.e.  $(1 + \epsilon)|\mathcal{R}| \leq |\text{opt}(I)|$ .

## 2.5. Weighted Geometric Set Cover

In this thesis we also consider a weighted Geometric Set Cover problem, which is a combination of the weighted and parameterized setting described in 2.1. We already argued in the introduction that there is no consensus of how it is defined, but when we discuss the weighted parametrized setting we will consider the following definition. There is a given weight function  $f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  and we would like to find a solution  $\mathcal{R}$ , such that  $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$  that minimizes  $\sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} f(R)$  among such sets  $\mathcal{R}$ .

**Definition 2.12.** The **weighted geometric set cover problem with  $\delta$ -extension** is the problem where for an input instance  $I = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C}, f)$  of weighted geometric set cover, the task is to output a solution  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  such that the  $\delta$ -extended set  $\{R^{+\delta} : R \in \mathcal{R}\}$  covers  $\mathcal{C}$  and it has weight not larger than the optimal solution to the problem without extension, i.e.  $\sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} f(R) \leq |\text{opt}(I)|$ .

We also consider weighted parameterized setting with  $\delta$ -extension, which we formally define below.

**Definition 2.13.** The **weighted geometric set cover problem with  $\delta$ -extension parameterized by the size of a solution** is a problem where for an input instance  $I = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C}, f, k)$  of weighted geometric set cover parametrized by the size of a solution  $k$ , the task is to output a solution  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  such that the  $\delta$ -extended set  $\{R^{+\delta} : R \in \mathcal{R}\}$  covers  $\mathcal{C}$ , uses no more than  $k$  sets, i.e.  $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$  and it has weight not larger than the optimal solution to the problem without extension, i.e.  $\sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} f(R) \leq |\text{opt}(I)|$ .



## Chapter 3

# APX-hardness of geometric set cover

In this section we analyze whether there exists a 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 1.1.** (*Axis-parallel segment set cover with  $\frac{1}{2}$ -extension is APX-hard*). *Unweighted geometric set cover with axis-parallel segments in the 2D plane is APX-hard (even with  $\frac{1}{2}$ -extension). That is, assuming  $P \neq NP$ , there does not exist a PTAS for this problem.*

Theorem 1.1 implies the following.

**Corollary 3.1.** (*rectangle set cover is APX-hard*). *Unweighted geometric set cover with axis-parallel rectangles is APX-hard (even with  $\frac{1}{2}$ -extension).*

We prove Theorem 1.1 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. MAX-(3,3)-SAT and statement of reduction

See Definition 2.5 for the definition of the CNF formula.

**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 and every clause contains exactly 3 literals of 3 different variables. Note that thus, the number of clauses is equal to the number of variables.

In our proof of Theorem 1.1 we use hardness of approximation of MAX-(3,3)-SAT proved in [Håstad, 2001] and described in Theorem 3.1 below.

**Definition 3.3** ( $\alpha$ -satisfiable MAX-3SAT formula). MAX-3SAT formula with  $m$  clauses is at most  $\alpha$ -satisfiable, if every assignment of variables satisfies no more than  $\alpha m$  clauses.

**Theorem 3.1.** [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 3.1 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 1.1.

**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 to  $S$  that satisfies at least  $15n - |X|$  clauses.*

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

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

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

TODO: Do the summary which dot corresponds to which lemma to have better structure  
We prove Lemma 3.1 in subsequent sections, but meanwhile let us prove Theorem 1.1 using Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 3.1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* 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  $(1/2)$ -extension. We construct an algorithm that solves the problem stated in Theorem 3.1, 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  $(\frac{7}{8} + \epsilon)$  satisfiable, we have:

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



From Lemma 3.1 we have:

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

343 Since a solution to  $I$  with  $\frac{1}{2}$ -extension is also a solution without any extension, by Lemma  
 344 3.1 (3), we have:

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

345 Therefore, by using the assumed  $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm, it is possible to distin-  
 346 guish the case when  $S$  is satisfiable: from the case when it is at most  $(\frac{7}{8} + \epsilon)n$  satisfiable,  
 347 it suffices to compare  $approx(I)$  with  $15n - (\frac{7}{8} + \epsilon)n$ . Hence, the assumed approximation  
 348 algorithm cannot exist, unless  $P = NP$ .  $\square$

## 349 3.2. Reduction

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

354 The construction will be composed of 2 types of gadgets: **VARIABLE-gadgets** and  
 355 **CLAUSE-gadgets**. **CLAUSE-gadgets** will be constructed using two **OR-gadgets** connected  
 356 together.

### 357 3.2.1. VARIABLE-gadget

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

361 **Points.** Define points  $a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h$  as follows, where  $L = 22n$ :




Figure 3.1: **VARIABLE-gadget**. We denote the set of points marked with black circles as  $\text{pointsVariable}_i$ , 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  $\text{chooseVariable}_i^{\text{true}}$ .

362

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

Let us define:

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

and, for any  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,

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

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

364 **Segments.** Let us define:

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

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

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

365 We also name two of these segment for future reference:  $\text{xTrueSegment}_i := (c_i, g_i)$ ,  
366  $\text{xFalseSegment}_i := (f_i, h_i)$ .

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

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

370 **Lemma 3.3.** *For any  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , points in  $\text{pointsVariable}_i$  can not be covered with fewer than*  
371 *3 segments from  $\text{segmentsVariable}_i$ .*

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

374 **Lemma 3.4.** *For every set  $A \subseteq \text{segmentsVariable}_i$  such that  $A$  covers  $\text{pointsVariable}_i$  and*  
375  *$\text{xTrueSegment}_i, \text{xFalseSegment}_i \in A$ , it holds that  $|A| \geq 4$ .*

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

### 378 3.2.2. OR-gadget

379 OR-gadget connects input and output segments (see Figure 3.2) in a way that is supposed to  
380 simulate a binary *or* function.

381 Input segments are the only segments that cover points outside of the gadget, as their left  
382 ends lie outside of it. Point  $v_{i,j}$  is the only one that can be covered by segments that do not  
383 belong to the gadget.

384 The OR-gadget has the property that every set of segments that covers all the points in  
385 the gadget uses at least 3 segments from it.. Moreover, the output segment belongs to the  
386 solution of size 3 only if at least one of the input segments belong to the solution. Therefore,  
387 optimum solutions restricted to the OR-gadget behave like a binary *or* function for the input  
388 segments.




Figure 3.2: **OR-gadget**. Segments from  $\text{chooseOr}_{i,j}^{\text{false}}$  are **red**, segments from  $\text{chooseOr}_{i,j}^{\text{true}}$  are blue (both **light blue** and **dark blue**), segments from  $\text{orMoveVariable}_{i,j}$  are **green** and **yellow**. **Dark blue** segment is the *output* segment. Grey segments  $\text{input}_x$  and  $\text{input}_y$  are input segments that are not part of  $\text{segmentsOr}_{i,j}$ .

389 **Points.**

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

$$\text{vec}_{i,j} := (20i + 3 + 3j, 4(n + 1) + 2j)$$

391 For integers  $i, j$ , define  $\{l_{i,j}, m_{i,j} \dots v_{i,j}\}$  as  $\{l_0, m_0 \dots v_0\}$  shifted by  $\text{vec}_{i,j}$ , i.e.  $l_{i,j} =$   
 392  $l_0 + \text{vec}_{i,j}$  etc.

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

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

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

395 **Segments.** We define set of segments in several parts:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{chooseOr}_{i,j}^{\text{false}} &:= \{(q_{i,j}, r_{i,j}), (s_{i,j}, u_{i,j})\}, \\
 \text{chooseOr}_{i,j}^{\text{true}} &:= \{(m_{i,j}, s_{i,j}), (o_{i,j}, u_{i,j}), (t_{i,j}, v_{i,j})\},
 \end{aligned}$$

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

396 Finally all segments in OR-gadget are defined as:

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

397 **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  $\text{pointsOr}_{i,j} - \{x\} \cup$   
 398  $\{v_{i,j}\}$  can be covered with 4 segments from  $\text{segmentsOr}_{i,j}$ .

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

401 **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*  
 402 *segments from  $\text{segmentsOr}_{i,j}$ .*

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

### 404 3.2.3. CLAUSE-gadget

405 A CLAUSE-gadget is responsible for determining whether variable values assigned in variable  
 406 gadgets satisfy the corresponding clause in the input formula  $\phi$ . It has a minimum solution  
 407 to weight  $w$  if and only if the clause is satisfied, i.e. at least one of the respective variables is  
 408 assigned the correct value. Otherwise, its minimum solution has weight  $w + 1$ . In this way,  
 409 by analyzing the cost of the minimum solution to the entire constructed instance, we will be  
 410 able to tell how many clauses it was possible to satisfy in the optimum solution to  $\phi$ .




Figure 3.3: **CLAUSE-gadget for a clause  $a \vee b \vee \neg c$ .** 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.

411 **Points.** First, we define auxiliary functions for literals. For a literal  $w$ , let  $\text{idx}(w)$  be the  
 412 index of the variable in  $w$ , and  $\text{neg}(w)$  be the Boolean value whether the variable is negated  
 413 in  $w$  or not.

414 Let us assume that clause  $C_i = a \vee b \vee c$  for any literals  $a, b, c$ . Then, we define points in  
 415 the gadget as:

$$\begin{aligned}
x_{i,0} &:= (20i, 4 \cdot \text{id}x(a) + 2 \cdot \text{neg}(c)), & x_{i,1} &:= (20i, 4(n+1)), \\
y_{i,0} &:= (20i+1, 4 \cdot \text{id}x(b) + 2 \cdot \text{neg}(b)), & y_{i,1} &:= (20i+1, 4(n+1)+4), \\
z_{i,0} &:= (20i+2, 4 \cdot \text{id}x(c) + 2 \cdot \text{neg}(c)), & z_{i,1} &:= (20i+2, 4(n+1)+6).
\end{aligned}$$

We are now ready to define set of points:

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

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

Note that these two points are equal:  $v_{i,0} = l_{i,1}$ . This translates to the fact, that output of the one OR-gadget is an input to the other OR-gadget to create *or* of 3 segments.

**Segments.** We also define segments for the clause gadget as below:

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

The CLAUSE-gadgets consist of two OR-gadgets. Ideally, we would place the  $i$ -th CLAUSE-gadget close to the  $\text{xTrueSegment}_{j_1}$  or  $\text{xFalseSegment}_{j_1}$  segments corresponding to the literals that occur in the  $i$ -th clause. It would be inconvenient to position them there, because between these segments there may be additional  $\text{xTrueSegment}_{j_2}$  or  $\text{xFalseSegment}_{j_2}$  segments corresponding to the other literals.

Instead, we use simple auxiliary gadgets to *transfer* whether the segment is in a solution, i.e. segments  $(x_{i,0}, x_{i,1}), (y_{i,0}, y_{i,1}), (z_{i,0}, z_{i,1})$  in this gadget. Each gadget consists of two segments  $(x_{i,0}, x_{i,1}), (x_{i,1}, a)$ . These are the only segments that can cover  $x_{i,1}$ . We place  $x_{i,0}$  on a segment that we want to transfer (i.e. segment responsible for choosing the variable value satisfying the corresponding literal). If in some solution  $x_{i,0}$  is already covered by this segment, then we can cover  $x_{i,1}$  by  $(x_{i,1}, a)$ , thus also covering  $a$ . If  $x_{i,0}$  is not covered by this segment, then the only way to cover  $x_{i,0}$  is to use segment  $(x_{i,0}, x_{i,1})$ . Intuitively, in any optimal solution the two segments *transfer* the state of whether  $x_{i,0}$  is covered onto whether  $a$  is covered. Therefore, the number of segments in the optimal solution is increased by one, and we get a point  $a$  that was effectively placed on some segment  $s$ , but it can be placed anywhere in the plane instead, consequently simplifying the construction.

**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 set  $\text{solClause}_i^{\text{true},a} \subseteq \text{segmentsClause}_i$  with  $|\text{solClause}_i^{\text{true},a}| = 11$  that covers all 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 in  $\text{chooseOr}_{i,0}^{\text{true}} \cup \text{chooseOr}_{i,1}^{\text{true}}$  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  $x = p_{i,1}$ , we obtain 8 segments in  $\text{chooseOr}_{i,0}^{\text{false}} \cup \text{chooseOr}_{i,1}^{\text{true}}$  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 a set  $\text{solClause}_i^{\text{false}} \subseteq \text{segmentsClause}_i$  with  $|\text{solClause}_i^{\text{false}}| = 12$  that covers all points in  $\text{pointsClause}_i$ .*

448 *Proof.* Using Lemma 3.6 twice we can cover  $\text{pointsOr}_{i,0}$  and  $\text{pointsOr}_{i,1}$  with 8 segments. To  
 449 cover the remaining points we additionally use:  $\{(x_{i,0}, x_{i,1}), (y_{i,0}, y_{i,1}), (z_{i,0}, z_{i,1}), (t_{i,1}, v_{i,1})\}$   
 450  $\square$

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

- 452 (1) *points in  $\text{pointsClause}_i$  can not be covered using any subset of segments from  $\text{segmentsClause}_i$*   
 453 *of size smaller than 12;*
- 454 (2) *points in  $\text{pointsClause}_i - \{x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}\}$  can not be covered using any subset of segments*  
 455 *from  $\text{segmentsClause}_i$  of size smaller than 11.*

*Proof of (1).* No segment in  $\text{segmentsClause}_i$  covers more than 1 point from

$$\{x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}, l_{i,0}, p_{i,0}, q_{i,0}, u_{i,0}, v_{i,0} = l_{i,1}, p_{i,1}, q_{i,1}, u_{i,1}, v_{i,1}\}.$$

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

457 *Proof of (2).* We can define disjoint sets  $X, Y, Z$  such that  $X \cup Y \cup Z \subseteq \text{pointsClause}_i -$   
 458  $\{x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}\}$  such that there are no segments in  $\text{segmentsClause}_i$  covering points from dif-  
 459 ferent sets. And we prove a lower bound for each of these sets. First, let:

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

460 No two points in  $X$  can be covered with one segment of  $\text{segmentsClause}_i$ , so it must be  
 461 covered with 3 different segments. Next we define other sets:

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

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

462 For both  $Y$  and  $Z$  we can check all of the subsets of 3 segments of  $\text{segmentsClause}_i$  to  
 463 conclude that none of them cover the considered, so both  $Y$  and  $Z$  have to be covered with  
 464 disjoint sets of 4 segments each.

465 Therefore,  $\text{pointsClause}_i - \{x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}\}$  must be covered with at least  $3 + 4 + 4 = 11$   
 466 segments from  $\text{segmentsClause}_i$ .  $\square$

### 467 3.2.4. Summary

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

469 **Lemma 3.10. Robustness to 1/2-extension.** *For every segment  $s \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $s$  and  $s^{+\frac{1}{2}}$  cover*  
 470 *the same points from  $\mathcal{C}$ .*

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

473 Within VARIABLE-gadget for any  $1 \leq i \leq n$  after  $\frac{1}{2}$ -extension:  $(c_i, g_i)$  does not cover  $b_i$ .

474 Within OR-gadget some of the segments are collinear and share one point; specifically, for  
 475 any  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $j \in \{0, 1\}$ , after  $\frac{1}{2}$ -extension:

- 476 •  $(l_{i,j}, n_{i,j})$  does not cover  $o_{i,j}$ ,
- 477 •  $(n_{i,j}, p_{i,j})$  does not cover  $m_{i,j}$ ,
- 478 •  $(t_{i,j}, v_{i,j})$  does not cover  $n_{i,j}$ .




Figure 3.4: **Schema of the whole construction.**

General layout of VARIABLE-gadgets and CLAUSE-gadgets and how they interact with each other.

479 Within CLAUSE-gadget, for any  $1 \leq i \leq n$  after  $\frac{1}{2}$ -extension:

- 480 •  $(o_{i,0}, u_{i,0})$  does not cover  $m_{i,1}$ ,
- 481 •  $(m_{i,1}, s_{i,1})$  does not cover  $u_{i,0}$ ,
- 482 •  $(y_{i,1}, p_{i,0})$  does not cover  $n_{i,1}$ .

483 For two consecutive VARIABLE-gadgets, for any  $1 \leq i < n$  after  $\frac{1}{2}$ -extension:  $(b_i, f_i)$  does  
 484 not cover  $b_{i+1}$  (nor  $f_{i-1}$  for  $i > 1$ ). Similarly  $(a_i, d_i)$  does not cover  $a_{i+1}$  (nor  $d_{i-1}$  for  $i > 1$ ),  
 485 because this segment is shorter than the previous one and  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  share y-coordinate.

486 For two consecutive CLAUSE-gadgets, segments from one do not cover anything from the  
 487 other, as the gadgets have width 9 and every leftmost x-coordinate is divisible by 20. Hence  
 488 two different gadgets do not interact with each other after  $\frac{1}{2}$ -extension.

489 Next we need to check whether VARIABLE-gadget's segments do not cover any points  
 490  $x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}$  or  $z_{i,0}$  from CLAUSE-gadget. For any  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , all points  $x_{j,0}, y_{j,0}$   
 491 and  $z_{j,0}$  have x-coordinate strictly positive. Segment  $(a_i, c_i)$  have length  $2L$  and  $c_i$  has x-  
 492 coordinate equal to  $-L$ , so after  $\frac{1}{2}$ -extension this segment does not cover any points with a  
 493 positive x-coordinate.

494 □

### 495 3.2.5. Summary of construction

Finally we define set of points and segments for the constructed instance:

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

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




Figure 3.5: **Schema of the whole construction.**

General layout of VARIABLE-gadgets and CLAUSE-gadgets and how they interact with each other.

### 3.3. 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 3.2 for the instance  $S$  of MAX-(3,3)-SAT.

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

*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 variable assignment in the optimum solution to  $S$  be  $\phi : \{x_1, x_2 \dots x_n\} \rightarrow \{\mathbf{true}, \mathbf{false}\}$ .

We cover every VARIABLE-gadget with solution described in Lemma 3.2, where in the  $i$ -th gadget we choose 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  $\mathbf{pointsClause}_i$  as  $a$ . Points in  $\mathbf{pointsClause}_i$  are covered with set  $\mathbf{solClause}_i^{\mathbf{true}, a}$  described in Lemma 3.7. For every clause that is not satisfied, say  $c_j$ , points in  $\mathbf{pointsClause}_j$  are covered with set  $\mathbf{solClause}_j^{\mathbf{false}}$  described in Lemma 3.8.

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



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

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

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

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

516 **Lemma 3.12.** *Suppose we have a solution  $\mathcal{R}$  of the instance  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$  of geometric set cover.*  
517 *Then there exists a solution  $\mathcal{R}'$ , such that  $|\mathcal{R}'| \leq |\mathcal{R}|$ , and  $\mathcal{R}'$  contains at most one of the*  
518 *segments  $\text{xTrueSegment}_i$  and  $\text{xFalseSegment}_i$  from each VARIABLE-gadget.*

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

523 To construct  $\mathcal{R}'$ , we first remove from  $\mathcal{R}$  all segments belonging to  $\text{segmentsVariable}_i$ .  
524 Recall that the  $i$ -th VARIABLE-gadget corresponds to variable  $x_i$  in  $S$ . As every variable in  
525  $S$  is used in exactly 3 clauses, then one literal  $x_i$  or  $\neg x_i$  must appear in at least 2 clauses. If  
526 that literal is  $x_i$ , then we add to the constructed solution all segments from  $\text{chooseVariable}_i^{\text{true}}$ ,  
527 otherwise we add all segments from  $\text{chooseVariable}_i^{\text{false}}$ .

528 Now, there exists at most one CLAUSE-gadget which needs adjustment to make  $\mathcal{R}'$  valid;  
529 assuming it is the  $j$ -th clause, then one of the points  $x_{j,0}, y_{j,0}$  or  $z_{j,0}$  for this CLAUSE-gadget  
530 might be not covered, say  $y_{j,0}$ . We amend the solution by adding  $(y_{j,0}, y_{j,1})$  to  $\mathcal{R}'$ .

531 By Lemma 3.4 we know that  $\mathcal{R}$  used at least 4 segments from  $\text{segmentsVariable}_i$ . Therefore,  
532 we removed at least 4 segments and added at most 4 segments, so  $|\mathcal{R}'| \leq |\mathcal{R}|$ .  $\square$

533 **Lemma 3.13.** *Suppose we have a solution  $\mathcal{R}$  of the instance  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$  of geometric set cover*  
534 *that is of size  $w$ . Then there exists a solution to  $S$  that satisfies at least  $15n - w$  clauses.*

535 *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  
536  $\mathcal{R}$  of the instance  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$  of geometric set cover, we use Lemma 3.12 to modify  $\mathcal{R}$  such that  
537 for any  $i$  it contains at most one of  $\text{xTrueSegment}_i$  and  $\text{xFalseSegment}_i$ ; this may decrease the  
538 cost of  $\mathcal{R}$ , but that does not matter in the subsequent construction. To simplify notation, in  
539 the remainder of this proof we use  $\mathcal{R}$  to refer to the modified solution.

Given  $\mathcal{R}$ , we construct a solution to  $S$  by defining an assignment of variables:

$$\phi : \{x_1, x_2 \dots x_n\} \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$$

540 that satisfies at least  $15n - w$  clauses in  $S$ .

**Definition of  $\phi$ .** Recall that due to Lemma 3.12,  $\mathcal{R}$  contains at most one of  $\text{xTrueSegment}_i$  and  $\text{xFalseSegment}_i$ .

We define the value  $\phi(x_i)$  for the variable  $x_i$  as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \phi(x_i) = \text{true} & \text{if } \text{xTrueSegment}_i \in \mathcal{R} \\ \phi(x_i) = \text{false} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

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

**Clauses satisfied with the chosen variable assignment.** For a clause  $c_i$ ,  $\mathcal{R}$  needs to use at least 11 segments to cover  $\text{pointsClause}_i - \{x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}\}$  in the  $i$ -th CLAUSE-gadget (Lemma 3.9).

Moreover, if none of the points  $\{x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}\}$  are covered by the segments from  $\mathcal{R} \cap \text{segmentsVariable}_i$ , then  $\mathcal{R}$  needs to cover  $\text{pointsClause}_i$  with at least 12 segments by Lemma 3.9.

Let us denote  $a$  as the amount of such clauses  $c_i$  for which none of the points  $x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}$  in  $\text{pointsClause}_i$  were covered by segments from  $\mathcal{R} \cap \text{segmentsVariable}_j$  for any  $1 \leq j \leq n$ .

Consider a clause  $c_i$  for which at least one of the points  $x_{i,0}, y_{i,0}, z_{i,0}$  in  $\text{pointsClause}_i$  were covered by segments from  $\mathcal{R} \cap \text{segmentsVariable}_j$  for some  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , then denote this point as  $t$  and say it corresponds to literal  $q$  and variable  $x_j$ . Point  $t$  can be only covered in  $\text{segmentsVariable}_j$  by a corresponding segment  $\text{xTrueSegment}_j$  or  $\text{xFalseSegment}_j$  (depending on whether the literal  $q$  is negated or not). From the definition of  $\phi$  and the fact that one of this segment is in  $\mathcal{R}$ , we know that  $\phi(j)$  has the value that evaluates  $w$  to be true. Therefore, clause  $c_i$  is satisfied.

Consequently,  $\phi$  satisfies all but at most  $a$  clauses in  $S$ .

To conclude, given a solution to  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$  of size  $w$  we constructed a variable assignment  $\phi$  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

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

Therefore  $\phi$  satisfies at least  $15n - w$  clauses of  $S$ . □

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 to  $S$  satisfies  $k$  clauses, then according to Lemma 3.13:

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

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

## Chapter 4

# Fixed-parameter tractable algorithm for geometric set cover problem

In this chapter we show fixed-parameter tractable algorithms for the geometric set cover problem in two different settings. Section 4.1 shows a fixed-parameter tractable algorithm for geometric set cover with unweighted segments. The remainder of the chapter presents a fixed-parameter tractable algorithm for geometric set cover with weighted segments with  $\delta$ -extension. We show an algorithm for the setting with  $\delta$ -extension, because the original problem with weights is W[1]-hard, as we show in Chapter 5.

We start with a shared definition for this problem. We define *extreme points* for a set of collinear points.

**Definition 4.1.** For a set of collinear points  $C$  in the plane, **extreme points** of  $C$  are the endpoints of the smallest segment that covers all points from set  $C$ .

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

### 4.1. Fixed-parameter tractable algorithm for unweighted segments

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

#### 4.1.1. Axis-parallel segments

**Theorem 4.1.** (*FPT for segment cover with axis-parallel segments*). There exists an algorithm that given a family  $\mathcal{P}$  of axis-parallel segments, a set of points  $C$  and a parameter  $k$ , runs in time  $\mathcal{O}(2^k)$ , and outputs a solution  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  such that  $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  covers all points in  $C$ , or determines that such a set  $\mathcal{R}$  does not exist.

*Proof.* 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  $a$  in that direction to cover. 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, all points on the 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 the line  $x = x_a$  that covers  $a$  can only cover a 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 the recursion can be stopped at depth  $k$ . If no branch finds a solution, then this means that a solution of size at most  $k$  does not exist.  $\square$

Note that the same algorithm can be used for segments in  $d$  directions, where we branch over  $d$  choices of directions, and it runs in complexity  $\mathcal{O}(d^k)$ .

#### 4.1.2. Segments in arbitrary directions

In this section we consider the setting where segments are not constrained to a constant number of directions. We present a fixed-parameter tractable algorithm, parameterized by the size of the solution.

**Theorem 1.2. (FPT for segment cover).** *There exists an algorithm that given a family  $\mathcal{P}$  of segments (in any direction), a set of points  $\mathcal{C}$  and a parameter  $k$ , runs in time  $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}(|\mathcal{C}| \cdot |\mathcal{P}|)^2$ , and outputs a solution  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  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 proving properties of any instance of the problem.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Given an instance  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C})$  of the segment cover problem, without 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.* Assume towards a contradiction that there is an instance  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C})$ , and two distinct subsets of  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $A, B$ , such that  $A \cap \mathcal{C} \subseteq B \cap \mathcal{C}$ .

We construct a set  $\mathcal{P}' := \mathcal{P} - \{A\}$ . We prove that for any solution  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C})$ , we can construct a solution  $\mathcal{R}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}'$ , such that  $|\mathcal{R}'| \leq |\mathcal{R}|$ . Let us take any solution  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C})$ . If  $A \in \mathcal{R}$ , then  $\mathcal{R}' := \mathcal{R} \cup \{B\} - \{A\}$ , otherwise  $\mathcal{R}' := \mathcal{R}$ . Let us consider the case when  $A \in \mathcal{R}$ , because the other case is trivial. Since  $A \cap \mathcal{C} \subseteq B \cap \mathcal{C}$ , then  $\mathcal{R} \cup \{B\} - \{A\}$  covers any point from  $\mathcal{C}$  that was covered by  $\mathcal{R}$ . Also,  $|\mathcal{R} \cup \{B\} - \{A\}| \leq |\mathcal{R}|$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** *Given an instance  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C})$  of the segment cover problem transformed by Lemma 4.1, if there exists a line  $L$  with at least  $k + 1$  points on it, then there exists a subset  $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ , of size at most  $k$ , such that every solution  $\mathcal{R}$  with  $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$  satisfies  $|A \cap \mathcal{R}| \geq 1$ . Moreover, such a subset can be found in polynomial time.*

*Proof.* 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  $L$ . Our proposed set is defined as:

$$A := \{\text{segment collinear with } L \text{ that covers } x_i \text{ and does not cover } x_{i-1} : i \in \{1, \dots, k\}\},$$

where for  $i = 1$  we just take a segment that covers  $x_1$ . If such a segment does not exist for any point  $x$  as above, then  $x$  does not give rise to any segment in  $A$ . We prove the lemma

by contradiction. Let us assume that there exists a solution  $\mathcal{R}$  of size at most  $k$  such that  $\mathcal{R} \cap A = \emptyset$ .

Let  $\mathcal{R}_L$  be the set of segments from  $\mathcal{R}$  that are collinear with  $L$ .

Every segment that is not collinear with  $L$  can cover at most one of the points that lie on this line. Hence, if  $\mathcal{R}_L$  was empty, then  $\mathcal{R}$  would cover at most  $k$  points on line  $L$ , but  $L$  had at least  $k + 1$  different points from  $\mathcal{C}$  on it.

Therefore, we know that  $\mathcal{R}_L$  is not empty and  $|\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_L| \leq k - 1$ . Segments from  $\mathcal{R} - \mathcal{R}_L$  can cover at most  $k - 1$  points among  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$ , therefore at least one of these points must be covered by segments from  $\mathcal{R}_L$ . We take the leftmost point from  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$  that is covered in  $\mathcal{R}_L$  and name it  $a$ . After the transformation from Lemma 4.1, in  $\mathcal{R}$  there is only one segment that starts in  $a$  and is collinear with  $L$ , therefore this segment must be in both  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $A$ . This contradiction concludes the proof that  $|A \cap \mathcal{R}| \geq 1$  for any solution  $\mathcal{R}$  of size at most  $k$ .  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.2.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* We will prove this theorem by presenting a branching algorithm that works in desired complexity. It first branches over the choice of segments to cover the lines with *many* points and then solves a small instance (where every line has at most  $k$  points) by checking all possible solutions.

**Algorithm.** We present a recursive algorithm. Given an instance of the problem:

- (1) Use Lemma 4.1 to remove some redundant segments from our instance.
- (2) If there exists a line with at least  $k + 1$  points from  $\mathcal{C}$ , we branch over the choice of adding to the solution one of the at most  $k$  possible segments provided by Lemma 4.2; name this segment  $s$  and name the set of points from  $\mathcal{C}$  that lie on  $s$  as  $S$ . By recursion, we find a solution  $\mathcal{R}$  for the instance  $(\mathcal{C} - S, \mathcal{P} - \{s\})$ , and parameter  $k - 1$ . We return  $\mathcal{R} \cup \{s\}$ . Note that if Lemma 4.2 returned  $\emptyset$ , then we respond NO.
- (3) If every line has at most  $k$  points on it and  $|\mathcal{C}| > k^2$ , then answer NO.
- (4) 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 4.2 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 the recursion we have  $|\mathcal{C}| \leq k^2$ , so  $|\mathcal{P}| \leq k^4$ , because every segment can be uniquely identified by the two extreme points it covers (by Lemma 4.1). Therefore, there are  $\binom{k^4}{k}$  possible solutions to check, each can be checked in time  $\mathcal{O}(k|\mathcal{C}|)$ . Thus, (3) takes time  $k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ .

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  $k$  possibilities. Candidates to branch over can be found on each level in time  $\mathcal{O}((|\mathcal{C}| \cdot |\mathcal{P}|)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ .

Reduction from Lemma 4.1 can be implemented in time  $\mathcal{O}((|\mathcal{C}| \cdot |\mathcal{P}|)^{\mathcal{O}(1)})$ .

It follows that the overall complexity is  $\mathcal{O}((|\mathcal{C}| \cdot |\mathcal{P}|)^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \cdot k^{\mathcal{O}(k)})$   $\square$

## 4.2. Fixed-parameter tractable algorithm for weighted segments with $\delta$ -extension

In this section we consider the geometric set cover problem for weighted segments relaxed with  $\delta$ -extension. We show that this problem admits an FPT algorithm when parameterized by the size of the solution and  $\delta$ . In the next chapter we show that the assumption about the problem being relaxed with  $\delta$ -extension is necessary: we prove that geometric set cover problem for weighted segments (without extension) is W[1]-hard, which means there does not exist any FPT algorithm parameterized by solution size for it, assuming  $\text{FPT} \neq \text{W}[1]$ .

**Theorem 1.3. (*FPT for weighted segment cover with  $\delta$ -extension*).** *There exists an algorithm that given a family  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $n$  weighted segments (in any direction), a set of  $m$  points  $\mathcal{C}$ , and parameters  $k$  and  $\delta > 0$ , runs in time  $f(k, \delta) \cdot (nm)^c$  for some computable function  $f$  and a constant  $c$  and outputs a set  $\mathcal{R}$  such that:*

- $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ ,
- $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$ ,
- $\mathcal{R}^{+\delta}$  covers all points in  $\mathcal{C}$ ,
- the weight of  $\mathcal{R}$  is not greater than the weight of an optimum solution of size at most  $k$  for this problem without  $\delta$ -extension,

or determines that there is no set  $\mathcal{R}$  with  $|\mathcal{R}| \leq k$  such that  $\mathcal{R}$  covers all points in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

To solve this problem we will introduce a lemma about choosing a *dense* subset of points. A dense subset of points for a set of collinear points  $C$  and parameters  $k$  and  $\delta$  is a subset of  $C$  such that if we cover it with at most  $k$  segments, these segments after  $\delta$ -extension will cover all of the points from  $C$ . We will prove that such set of size bounded by some function  $f(k, \delta)$  always exists (Lemma 4.3). Later, Lemma 4.3 will allow us to find a kernel for our original problem.

**Definition 4.2.** For a set of collinear points  $C$ , a subset  $A \subseteq C$  is  $(k, \delta)$ -**dense** if for any set of segments  $R$  that covers  $A$  and such that  $|R| \leq k$ , it holds that  $R^{+\delta}$  covers  $C$ .

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

*Proof.* We prove this for a fixed  $\delta$  by induction on  $k$ .

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

- $A$  is subset of  $C$ ,
- $A$  is  $(\ell, \delta)$ -dense for every  $1 \leq \ell \leq k$ ,
- $|A| \leq (2 + \frac{2}{\delta})^k$ ,
- the extreme points of  $C$  are in  $A$ .

711 **Base case for  $k = 1$ .** It is sufficient that  $A$  consists of the extreme points of  $C$ .  
712 If they are covered with one segment, it must be a segment that includes the extreme  
713 points from  $C$ , so it covers the whole set  $C$ .  
714 There are at most 2 extreme points in  $C$  and  $2 < 2 + \frac{2}{\delta}$ .

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

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

719 We define  $M = \lceil 1 + \frac{2}{\delta} \rceil$  subsegments of  $s$  by splitting  $s$  into  $M$  closed segments of equal  
720 length. We name these segments  $v_i$ , note that  $|v_i| = \frac{|s|}{M}$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq M$ .

721 Let  $C_i$  be the subset of  $C$  consisting of points lying on  $v_i$ .

722 Let  $t_i$  be the segment with endpoints being the extreme points of  $C_i$ . It might be a  
723 degenerate segment if  $C_i$  consists of one point, or  $t_i$  might be empty if  $C_i$  is empty.

724 Figure 4.1 presents an example of such segments  $v_i$  and  $t_i$ .




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

Example for  $M = 7$  and some set of points (marked with black circles). The top panel shows segments  $v_i$  and the bottom panel shows segments  $t_i$  on the same set of points.  $a$  and  $b$  are the extreme points and therefore segment  $s$  ends at  $a$  and  $b$ . Red segments depict the split into  $M$  segments of equal length  $v_i$ . Blue segments depict the 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  $b$ .

725 We use the inductive hypothesis to choose  $(k, \delta)$ -dense sets  $A_i$  for sets  $C_i$ . Note that if  
726  $|C_i| \leq 1$ , then  $A_i = C_i$  and it is still a  $(k, \delta)$ -dense set for  $C_i$ .

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

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

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

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

For every segment  $t_i$ , if there exists a segment  $x$  in  $\mathcal{R}$  that 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  $(k, \delta)$ -dense for  $t_i$  and  $C_i$ ,  $(\mathcal{R} - \{x\})^{+\delta}$  covers  $C_i$ . So  $\mathcal{R}^{+\delta}$  covers  $C_i$  as well.

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  $t_i$ . An example of such segments is depicted in Figure 4.2. Let us consider any such  $t_i$ . By the inductive hypothesis, the endpoints of  $s$  are in  $A_1$  and  $A_M$  respectively, so  $\mathcal{R}$  must cover them. For each endpoint of  $s$ , there exists a segment that contains this endpoint and intersects  $t_i$ . Let us call these two segments  $y$  and  $z$ . It follows that:  $|y| + |z| + |t_i| \geq |s|$ . Since  $|t_i| \leq |v_i| = \frac{|s|}{M} \leq \frac{|s|}{1+\frac{2}{\delta}} = \frac{|s|\delta}{\delta+2}$ , 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 one segment  $t_i$ .**

Both panels show the same set  $\mathcal{C}$  (black circles), the same as in Figure 4.1. The top panel shows blue segments  $t_i$  for  $M = 7$ . The bottom panel shows green segments – solution  $\mathcal{R}$  of size 4. All segments from  $\mathcal{R}$  intersect  $t_4$ . Segments  $z$  and  $y$  are named in the figure.

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

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

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

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

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

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

□

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

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



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

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

755 Choose any long line  $L$ . Every segment from  $\mathcal{R}$  which is not collinear with  $L$ , covers at  
 756 most one point that lies on  $L$ .  $L$  is long, so there are at least  $k+1$  points from  $\mathcal{C}$  that lie on  
 757  $L$ . This implies that there must be a segment in  $\mathcal{R}$  that is collinear with  $L$ .

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

760 **Claim 4.2.** *If there are more than  $k^2$  points from  $\mathcal{C}$  that do not lie on any long line, then  $\mathcal{C}$*   
 761 *can not be covered with  $k$  segments.*

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

765 Every segment  $s$  from  $\mathcal{R}$  covers at most  $k$  points from  $A$ . This is because if  $s$  covered at  
 766 least  $k+1$  points from  $A$ , then the line in the direction of  $s$  would be a long line and that  
 767 contradicts the definition of  $A$ .

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

771 We are now ready to give a proof of Theorem 1.3.

772 *Proof of Theorem 1.3.* Our goal is to either answer NO or to find a kernel  $(\mathcal{C}', \mathcal{P}')$  of size  
 773 bounded by  $f(k)$  for some function  $f$ , such that:

- 774 • (*Property 1*) for every solution  $\mathcal{R}$  to  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$  of size at most  $k$ , there exists a set  $\mathcal{R}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{P}'$   
 775 such that  $|\mathcal{R}_1| \leq k$ , the weight of  $\mathcal{R}_1$  is not greater than the weight of  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_1$  covers  
 776  $\mathcal{C}'$ ;
- 777 • (*Property 2*) for every set  $\mathcal{R}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}'$  such that  $|\mathcal{R}_2| \leq k$  and  $\mathcal{R}_2$  covers all points in  $\mathcal{C}'$ ,  
 778  $\mathcal{R}_2^{+\delta}$  covers all points in the original set  $\mathcal{C}$ .

779 If we found such sets  $(\mathcal{C}', \mathcal{P}')$ , using *Property 1* we know that an optimum solution of size  
 780 at most  $k$  to  $(\mathcal{C}', \mathcal{P}')$  has no greater weight than an optimum solution of size at most  $k$  to  
 781  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$ . Using *Property 2* we know that any solution to  $(\mathcal{C}', \mathcal{P}')$  after  $\delta$ -extension covers  $\mathcal{C}$ .

782 Therefore, finding such sets and solving the instance  $(\mathcal{C}', \mathcal{P}')$  by iterating over all of the  
 783 subsets of  $\mathcal{P}'$  of size at most  $k$  in desired complexity is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.3.

784 **Definition of  $\mathcal{C}'$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$ .** Let us name the number of different long lines as  $l$ . Applying  
 785 Claims 4.1 and 4.2, if we have more than  $k$  different long lines or more than  $k^2$  points from  
 786  $\mathcal{C}$  that do not lie on any long line, then we answer NO, because these lemmas prove that there  
 787 is no solution of size at most  $k$  to this instance.

788 Otherwise, we can split  $\mathcal{C}$  into at most  $k+1$  sets:

- 789 •  $D$ : points that do not lie on any long line,  $|D| \leq k^2$ ;
- 790 •  $C_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq l$ : points that lie on the  $i$ -th long line,  $|C_i| > k$ .

Note that sets  $C_i$  do not need to be disjoint.

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

We define  $\mathcal{C}' := D \cup (\bigcup A_i)$ .  $\mathcal{C}'$  has size at most  $k^2 + k(2 + \frac{2}{\delta})^k$ . We define  $\mathcal{P}'$  as follows: for every pair of points  $\mathcal{C}'$ , we choose one segment from  $\mathcal{P}$  that has the lowest weight among segments that cover these points or decide that there is no segment that covers them. There are at most  $|\mathcal{C}'|^2$  different segments in  $\mathcal{P}'$ , therefore both  $\mathcal{P}'$  and  $\mathcal{C}'$  have size bounded by  $\mathcal{O}((k^2 + k(2 + \frac{2}{\delta})^k)^2)$ .

**Proof of Property 2.** Firstly, we prove that for every set  $\mathcal{R}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}'$  such that  $|\mathcal{R}_2| \leq k$  and  $\mathcal{R}_2$  covers points in  $\mathcal{C}'$ ,  $\mathcal{R}_2^{+\delta}$  covers points in the original instance  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Let us take such a set  $\mathcal{R}_2$ .

$\mathcal{C}$  is partitioned into several parts – sets  $D$  and  $C_i$ . Points from  $D$  are covered by  $\mathcal{R}_2$ , because  $D$  is part of  $\mathcal{C}'$ . Each point from any  $A_i$  is covered, because  $A_i$  is a part of  $\mathcal{C}'$ ;  $A_i$  is a  $(k, \delta)$ -dense set for  $C_i$ , therefore  $\mathcal{R}_2^{+\delta}$  covers all points in  $C_i$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{R}_2^{+\delta}$  covers all points in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Proof of Property 1.** Secondly, we prove that for every solution  $\mathcal{R}$  to  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P})$  of size at most  $k$ , there exists a set  $\mathcal{R}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{P}'$  such that  $|\mathcal{R}_1| \leq k$ , the weight of  $\mathcal{R}_1$  is not greater than the weight of  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_1$  covers  $\mathcal{C}'$ .

For every segment in  $\mathcal{R}$ , say  $s$ , let us look at the points from  $\mathcal{C}'$  that lie on  $s$  and call this set of points  $F$ .  $F$  is of course a set of collinear points. We can cover  $F$  with any segment that covers extreme points of  $F$ , because all other points lie on the segment between these points. Therefore, we can replace  $s$  with a segment  $s'$  that has lowest weight among the points that cover the extreme points of  $F$ . Such a segment belongs to  $\mathcal{P}'$ , because this is how it was defined. Segment  $s'$  has weight no greater than the weight of  $s$ , because  $s$  also covers  $F$ .

Therefore, we produced the set  $\mathcal{R}_1$  that has size not greater than the size of  $\mathcal{R}$  (because some segments  $s$  can map to the same segment  $s'$ ), weight not greater than  $\mathcal{R}$ , and it covers  $\mathcal{C}'$ .

**Complexity** We find a solution of  $(\mathcal{C}', \mathcal{P}')$  by iterating over all the possible subsets of  $\mathcal{P}'$ . Finding sets  $\mathcal{P}'$  and  $\mathcal{C}'$  and then solving problem for kernel has overall complexity  $(|\mathcal{P}| + |\mathcal{C}|)^{\mathcal{O}(1)} \mathcal{O}((2 + \frac{2}{\delta})^k) + \mathcal{O}((k^2 + k(2 + \frac{2}{\delta})^k)^k)$ .  $\square$

## Chapter 5

# W[1]-hardness for axis-parallel weighted segments

In this chapter we consider the geometric set cover problem with axis-parallel or right-diagonal weighted segments. In Theorem 1.4 below, we prove that this problem is W[1]-hard when parameterized by the size of the solution.

We believe that the below construction can be improved to only utilize the axis-parallel segments.

**Theorem 1.4.** *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 when parameterized 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.*

### 5.1. Grid Tiling

In order to prove Theorem 1.4 we will show a reduction from a W[1]-hard problem: grid tiling. This problem was introduced in [Marx, 2007] (the author called it matrix tiling instead). It was originally described as an approximation problem, but W[1]-hardness follows directly from the theorems stated there. For a more contemporary description of this problem and a proof of W[1]-hardness, see Chapter 14 of [Cygan et al., 2015].

**Definition 5.1.** We define the **powerset** of a set  $A$ , denoted as  $\text{Pow}(A)$ , as the set of all subsets of  $A$ , i.e.  $\text{Pow}(A) = \{B : B \subseteq A\}$ .

**Definition 5.2.** 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 decide whether there exist functions  $x, y : \{1 \dots k\} \rightarrow \{1 \dots n\}$  that assign colors from  $\{1 \dots n\}$  to respectively columns and rows of the grid, so that  $(x(i), y(j)) \in f(i, j)$  for all  $i, j \in \{1 \dots k\}$ .

In short, in the grid tiling problem one needs to assign numbers to rows and columns in such a way that for every pair of a row and a column, the pair of colors assigned to the row and column belongs to the allowed set of tiles for this pair. The next theorem describes the complexity of this problem, which is W[1]-hard when parameterized by the size of the grid.

	$x(1) = 3$	$x(2) = 1$	$x(3) = 3$	$x(4) = 7$
$y(4) = 1$	$(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1}); (2, 2);$ $(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}); (3, 9)$	$(1, 1); (3, 1)$	$(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}); (7, 2)$	$(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1}); (\mathbf{7}, \mathbf{1})$
$y(3) = 1$	$(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1}); (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1});$ $(4, 2); (8, 2)$	$(1, 1); (1, 3)$	$(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}); (4, 3)$	$(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2}); (\mathbf{7}, \mathbf{1})$
$y(2) = 6$	$(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{6}); (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{6})$	$(1, 2); (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{6});$ $(2, 6)$	$(2, 6); (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{6})$	$(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{6}); (\mathbf{7}, \mathbf{6})$
$y(1) = 4$	$(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{4}); (2, 6);$ $(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{4}); (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{9})$	$(1, 4); (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{9})$	$(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{4}); (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{9})$	$(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{9}); (\mathbf{7}, \mathbf{4})$

Figure 5.1: **Example of a grid tiling instance and its solution.**

In the first row and column of the table you can see the solution: functions  $x$  and  $y$ . The tiles used in this solution are marked in **bold**. If we instead chose the tiles marked in **blue** (whenever there is one, taking the tile marked in **bold** otherwise), then that corresponds to setting  $x(1) = 2$ , and would also form a correct solution. On the other hand, if we instead chose the tiles marked in **red** (as before), then this corresponds to setting  $y(1) = 9$  and  $x(4) = 2$  and that would **not** form a correct solution. Even though the first row is correct, the cell with coordinates  $(3, 4)$  requires tile  $(2, 1)$ , not  $(2, 2)$  (marked in **bold red**).

**Theorem 5.1.** [Marx, 2007] *Grid tiling is  $W[1]$ -hard when parameterized by  $k$  and assuming ETH, there is no  $f(k) \cdot n^{o(k)}$ -time algorithm solving the grid tiling problem for any computable function  $f$ .*

The remainder of this section is devoted to proving Theorem 1.4 by a reduction from a grid tiling problem instance with parameter  $k$  (number of rows in the grid) to a geometric set cover instance with parameter  $k^2$  (size of solution). This reduction is described in Lemma 5.1. This proves the  $W[1]$ -hardness of the geometric set cover problem, because if we could solve it with an FPT algorithm, then we could also solve the grid tiling problem (which we reduced to the geometric set cover). Therefore, geometric set cover with setting described in Theorem 1.4 is at least as hard as the grid tiling problem.

## 5.2. Statement of reduction

Let us denote an instance of grid tiling problem as  $(n, k, f)$  consisting of:

- the number of colors  $n$ ,
- the size of the grid  $k$ ,
- the function specifying the allowed tiles  $f : \{1, \dots, k\} \times \{1, \dots, k\} \rightarrow \text{Pow}(\{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, n\})$ .

Let us also define constants:

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &:= \frac{1}{2k^2} \\ \delta &:= \frac{1}{4k^4} \\ W_{\text{hv}} &:= 2k^2(n^2 + 1) - 4k^2\epsilon - 4k(1 - \epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

which are going to be used when defining the weight of the constructed instance of geometric set cover with weighted segments.

871 **Lemma 5.1.** *Given an instance  $(n, k, f)$  of the grid tiling problem, we can construct an*  
 872 *instance  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w, 3k^2 + 2k)$  of geometric set cover with weighted segments such that:*

873 (1) *if the answer to  $(n, k, f)$  is YES, then there exists a solution to  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w, 3k^2 + 2k)$  of*  
 874 *weight at most  $W_{\text{hv}} + k^2\delta$ ;*

875 (2) *if there exists a solution to  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w, 3k^2 + 2k)$  of weight at most  $W_{\text{hv}} + k^2\delta$ , then the*  
 876 *answer to  $(n, k, f)$  is YES.*

877 First, let us prove Theorem 1.4 using Lemma 5.1.

878 *Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Let us take any instance  $(n, l, f)$  of the grid tiling problem. We prove  
 879 the theorem by contradiction, therefore we assume that geometric set cover with weighted  
 880 segments parameterized by solution size  $k$  admits a  $g(k) \cdot n^{o(\sqrt{k})}$ -time algorithm for some  
 881 computable function  $g$ .

882 Using Lemma 5.1 let us construct an instance  $I$  for  $(n, l, f)$ . Let us assume that the  
 883 optimum solution of size at most  $k$  to the instance  $I$  has weight  $u$ . Using (2) we know that if  
 884  $u \leq W_{\text{hv}} + k^2\delta$ , then the answer to  $(n, l, f)$  is YES. If  $u > W_{\text{hv}} + k^2\delta$ , then using (1) we know  
 885 that the answer to  $(n, l, f)$  must be NO.

886 Therefore if we could find the solution in time  $g(k) \cdot n^{o(\sqrt{k})}$ , then we could solve the grid  
 887 tiling problem in time  $g(l) \cdot n^{o(l)}$  by constructing an instance of the set cover with weighted  
 888 segments, solving it for parameter  $k = 3l^2 + 2l$  in time  $n^{o(\sqrt{3l^2+2l})}$  and then answering based  
 889 on the weight of the optimum solution. As  $\mathcal{O}(n^{o(l)}) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(n^{o(\sqrt{3l^2+2l})})$ , the existence of this  
 890 algorithm contradicts Theorem 5.1. Hence such an algorithm can not exist.  $\square$

891 We prove Lemma 5.1 in subsequent sections. First, we define a constructed instance  $I$ ,  
 892 later property (1) is proved by Lemma 5.2 and property (2) is proved by Lemma 5.6.

893 In the proof of Lemma 5.6 we do not use the assumption that the solution is bounded  
 894 by the size, which the problem is parametrized by,  $3k^2 + 2k$ . If we had a permissive FPT  
 895 algorithm that finds a solution of any size that still has weight no more than  $W_{\text{hv}} + k^2\delta$ , then  
 896 we still would have a contradiction with grid tiling being W[1]-hard in proof of Theorem 1.4.  
 897 Thus, this reduction proves that the problem is not only W[1]-hard, but assuming ETH there  
 898 also does not exist permissive FPT algorithm for this problem. Formally we state this in the  
 899 Theorem 5.2.

900 **Theorem 5.2. (Permissive FPT does not exist).** *Consider the problem of covering a*  
 901 *set  $\mathcal{C}$  of points using segments from a set  $\mathcal{P}$  with non-negative weights  $w : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  so that*  
 902 *the weight of the cover is minimal. Let  $\mathcal{R}^k$  be the optimum solution to this problem of size at*  
 903 *most  $k$ . The task is to find a solution  $\mathcal{R}$  of any size such that weight of  $\mathcal{R}$  is not greater than*  
 904 *the weight of  $\mathcal{R}^k$ .*

905 *Assuming ETH, there is no algorithm for this problem with running time  $f(k) \cdot (|\mathcal{C}| +$   
 906  $|\mathcal{P}|)^{o(\sqrt{k})}$  for any computable function  $f$ . Moreover, this holds even if all segments in  $\mathcal{P}$  are*  
 907 *axis-parallel or right-diagonal.*

### 908 5.3. Construction of Geometric Set Cover instance

909 We construct an instance  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w, 3k^2 + 2k)$  of geometric set cover as follows.

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

Define  $\text{match}_v(i, j)$  and  $\text{match}_h(i, j)$  as boolean functions denoting whether two points share x or y coordinate:

$\text{match}_v(i, j)$  is **true**  $\iff$   $\text{order}(i)$  and  $\text{order}(j)$  have the same x coordinate,

$\text{match}_h(i, j)$  is **true**  $\iff$   $\text{order}(i)$  and  $\text{order}(j)$  have the same y coordinate.

### 911 5.3.1. Points

For  $1 \leq i, j \leq k$  and  $1 \leq t \leq n^2$  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 us 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 recall that  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2k^2}$ . 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 the point set as follows:

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

912 **Definition 5.3.** For every point  $p \in H$ , we name point  $p^L$  its **left guard** and point  $p^R$  its  
913 **right guard**.

914 Similarly for every points  $p \in V$ , we name point  $p^D$  its **lower guard** and point  $p^U$  its  
915 **upper guard**.

### 916 5.3.2. Segments

917 For  $1 \leq i, j \leq k$  and  $1 \leq t, t_1, t_2 \leq n^2$  define segments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

918 Next, we define sets of vertical and horizontal segments:

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

919

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

920 An example is depicted in Figure 5.3.

Finally, we also define a set of right-diagonal segments:

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

921 An example of such segments is depicted in Figure 5.2.

922 Every segment in **DIAG** connects points  $(i(n^2+1)+t, j \cdot (n^2+1))$  and  $(i \cdot (n^2+1), j(n^2+1) + t)$   
 923 for some  $1 \leq i, j \leq k, 1 \leq t \leq n^2$ . The line on which it lies can be described by linear equation  
 924  $x + y = t + (i + j)(n^2 + 1)$ , thus these segments are in fact right-diagonal.

925 The constructed segment set is defined as:

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

926 The weight of each segment in  $\text{HOR} \cup \text{VER}$  is equal to its length, while every segment in  
 927 **DIAG** has weight  $\delta$ .

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

## 928 5.4. Proof that reduction is correct

929 Now, we prove that the constructed instance of geometric set cover with weighted segments  
 930 indeed gives a correct and sound reduction of the grid tiling problem. Lemma 5.2 proves that  
 931 if a solution to the instance of the grid tiling instance exists, then there exists a solution with  
 932 suitably bounded size and weight of the constructed instance of geometric set cover. Then  
 933 Lemma 5.6 proves that if there is a solution to the geometric set cover instance with bounded  
 934 weight, then there exists a solution to the original grid tiling instance.

935 **Lemma 5.2.** *If there exists a solution to the grid tiling instance  $(f_{i,j})$ , then there exists*  
 936 *a solution to the instance  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w, 3k^2 + 2k)$  of geometric set cover with weight  $W_{\text{hv}} + k^2\delta$ .*

937 *Proof.* Suppose there exists a solution  $x, y$  of the instance  $(f_{i,j})$  of the grid tiling problem.

938 We define the proposed solution  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  of the instance of geometric set cover in three



Figure 5.2: **Vertices and segments in DIAG.**

This is an example of constructed points any  $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ . Points from  $H$  and  $V$  are marked in black, their guards are marked in blue. You can also see segments from DIAG with their weights (equal to  $\delta$ ).





Figure 5.3: **Vertices and segments in HOR.**

This is an example for  $n = 2$  and any  $1 \leq j \leq k$ . Points from  $H$  are marked in black, their guards are marked in light blue.  $t_{i,j}$  is a notation that we use for  $\text{order}^{-1}(i, j)$ . Segments are represented as arcs between endpoints. You can see  $\text{horBeg}_{j,t}$  segments in red.  $\text{horBeg}_{j,1}$  is degenerated to a single point at  $h_{1,1,t_{1,1}}^L$ . Segments  $\text{hor}_{i,j,t_{x_1,y},t_{x_2,y}}$  are marked in blue and green. Blue segments connect  $t_{x_1,y}$  and  $t_{x_2,y}$  such that they share y-coordinate equal to 1, for green segments it is equal to 2.

939 parts:  $D \subseteq \text{DIAG}$ ,  $A \subseteq \text{HOR}$  and  $B \subseteq \text{VER}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 D &:= \{(v_{i,j,t}, h_{i,j,t}) : 1 \leq i, j \leq k, t = \text{order}^{-1}(x(i), y(j))\}, \\
 A &:= \{\text{horBeg}_{i, \text{order}^{-1}(x(1), y(i))} : 1 \leq i \leq k\} \\
 &\quad \cup \{\text{horEnd}_{i, \text{order}^{-1}(x(k), y(i))} : 1 \leq i \leq k\} \\
 &\quad \cup \{\text{hor}_{i,j, \text{order}^{-1}(x(i), y(j)), \text{order}^{-1}(x(i+1), y(j))} : 1 \leq i < k, 1 \leq j \leq k\}, \\
 B &:= \{\text{verBeg}_{i, \text{order}^{-1}(x(i), y(1))} : 1 \leq i \leq k\} \\
 &\quad \cup \{\text{verEnd}_{i, \text{order}^{-1}(x(i), y(k))} : 1 \leq i \leq k\} \\
 &\quad \cup \{\text{ver}_{i,j, \text{order}^{-1}(x(i), y(j)), \text{order}^{-1}(x(i), y(j+1))} : 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j < k\}, \\
 \mathcal{R} &:= D \cup A \cup B.
 \end{aligned}$$

940 Since  $\mathcal{C} = H \cup V$ , we show that  $\mathcal{R}$  covers the whole set  $H$ ; the proof for  $V$  is analogous.

941 Fix any  $1 \leq j \leq k$  and define  $t_i := \text{order}^{-1}(x(i), y(j))$ . The two leftmost segments in  $A$   
 942 for this  $j$  are  $\text{horBeg}_{j,t_1} = (h_{1,j,1}^L, h_{1,j,t_1}^L)$  and  $\text{hor}_{1,j,t_1,t_2} = (h_{1,j,t_1}^R, h_{2,j,t_2}^L)$ . Therefore, points  
 943  $h_{1,j,x}, h_{1,j,x}^L$  and  $h_{1,j,x}^R$  for all  $1 \leq x \leq n^2$  are covered by  $\text{horBeg}_{j,t_1}$  and  $\text{hor}_{1,j,t_1,t_2}$ , excluding  
 944 point  $h_{1,j,t_1}$ .

945 Analogously for  $2 \leq i \leq k-1$ , the two consecutive segments  $\text{hor}_{i-1,j,t_{i-1},t_i}$  and  $\text{hor}_{i,j,t_i,t_{i+1}}$   
 946 cover points  $h_{i,j,x}, h_{i,j,x}^L$  and  $h_{i,j,x}^R$  for all  $1 \leq x \leq n^2$ , excluding point  $h_{i,j,t_i}$ .

947 Finally  $\text{hor}_{k-1,j,t_{k-1},t_k}$  and  $\text{horEnd}_{j,t_k}$  cover all points  $h_{k,j,x}, h_{k,j,x}^L$  and  $h_{k,j,x}^R$  for  $1 \leq x \leq n^2$ ,  
 948 excluding point  $h_{k,j,t_k}$ .

949  $D$  covers all points  $h_{i,j,t_i}$  and  $v_{i,j,t_i}$ . As  $j$  was chosen arbitrarily, all points in  $H$  are covered.  
 The size of this proposed solution is:

$$|\mathcal{R}| = |D| + |A| + |B| = k^2 + (k+1)k + (k+1)k = 3k^2 + 2k.$$

950 Then, we need to compute the total weight of the solution  $\mathcal{R}$ . First, we compute the sum  
 951 of weights of segments in  $A$ . Fix  $1 \leq j \leq k$  and consider segments collinear with the  $j$ -th  
 952 horizontal line. All points  $h_{i,j,t}, h_{i,j,t}^L$  and  $h_{i,j,t}^R$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$  and  $1 \leq t \leq n^2$  are covered  
 953 by  $A$  excluding points  $h_{i,j, \text{order}^{-1}(x(i), y(j))}$ . Every such point leaves a gap of length  $2\epsilon$  between  
 954  $h_{i,j, \text{order}^{-1}(x(i), y(j))}^L$  and  $h_{i,j, \text{order}^{-1}(x(i), y(j))}^R$ . Therefore, the total weight of segments in  $A$  that  
 955 lie on the line in question equals the length of the segment  $(h_{1,1,1}^L, h_{i,k,n^2}^R)$  minus  $2\epsilon k$ , which is

$k(n^2 + 1) - 2(1 - \epsilon) - 2k\epsilon$ . We need to multiply that by  $k$ , as we consider all possible values of  $j$ .

Computation for vertical segments is analogous and yields the same result. Every segment in  $D$  has weight  $\delta$ , therefore the sum of all weights is equal to:

$$2k(k(n^2 + 1) - 2(1 - \epsilon) - 2k\epsilon) + k^2\delta = W_{\text{hv}} + k^2\delta. \quad \square$$

Now we present a few additional properties of the constructed instance of the geometric set cover that help us to prove Lemma 5.6.

**Claim 5.1.** *In any solution to the instance  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w, 3k^2 + 2k)$ :*

- *the left and right guards of points in  $H$  (points in  $\{p^L : p \in H\} \cup \{p^R : p \in H\}$ ) have to be covered with segments from **HOR**,*
- *the lower and upper guards of points in  $V$  (points in  $\{p^D : p \in V\} \cup \{p^U : p \in V\}$ ) have to be covered with segments from **VER**.*

*Proof.* We prove the claim for the points from  $H$  as the proof for points from  $V$  is analogous.

Every segment in **VER** is vertical and has x-coordinate equal to  $i(n^2 + 1)$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , so they all have different x-coordinate than any left or right guard of points in  $H$ .

For every point  $x$  which is a left or right guard of a point in  $H$ , there are  $kn^2$  segments from **DIAG** that intersect with the horizontal line that goes through  $x$ . All of these segments intersect with this line in points from set  $H$ , therefore none of them covers any of the guards.

Therefore none of the segments from **VER** or **DIAG** covers any of the guards of the points in  $H$ .  $\square$

**Claim 5.2.** *For any  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$  and any solution to the instance  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w, 3k^2 + 2k)$ , all but at most one point  $h_{i,j,t}$  and at most one point  $v_{i,j,t}$  for  $1 \leq t \leq n^2$  must be covered with segments from **HOR** or **VER**.*

*Proof.* We prove the claim for horizontal segments, as the proof for vertical segments is analogous.

We prove this by contradiction. Assume that we have two points  $h_{i,j,t_1}, h_{i,j,t_2}, 1 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq n^2$ , such that they are not covered with segments from **HOR**.

Point  $h_{i,j,t_1}^R$  has to be covered with a segment from **HOR** by Claim 5.1. Every segment in **HOR** covering  $h_{i,j,t_1}^R$ , but not  $h_{i,j,t_1}$  must start at  $h_{i,j,t_1}^R$  and all such segments cover also  $h_{i,j,t_2}$ . This contradicts the assumption, which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.3.** *For every solution  $\mathcal{R}$  to the instance  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w, 3k^2 + 2k)$ , the sum of weights of segments chosen from sets **HOR** and **VER** is at least  $W_{\text{hv}}$ .*

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

We provide a lower bound for the sum of lengths of vertical segments from  $\mathcal{R} \cap \text{VER}$ . This bound is the same for each  $i$  and is the same for horizontal lines, thus we need to multiply such a bound by  $2k$ .

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

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

991 (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  
 992 by segments from **VER** (Claim 5.2). Its guards (see Definition 5.3)  $v_{i,j,t}^U$  and  $v_{i,j,t}^D$  have  
 993 to be covered in **VER** (Claim 5.1). Therefore, at most  $k$  spaces of length  $2\epsilon$  can be left  
 994 not covered by segments from **VER** between  $v_{i,1,1}^D$  and  $v_{i,k,n^2}^U$ .

The sum of these lower bounds for vertical and horizontal lines is:

$$2k(k(n^2 + 1) - 2k\epsilon - 2(1 - \epsilon)) = 2k^2(n^2 + 1) - 4k^2\epsilon - 4k(1 - \epsilon) = W_{\text{hv}}. \quad \square$$

995 **Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a solution to a constructed instance  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w, 3k^2 + 2k)$  with weight at*  
 996 *most  $W_{\text{hv}} + k^2\delta$ . Then for every  $1 \leq i, j \leq k$  there exists  $1 \leq t \leq n^2$  such that:*

- 997 (1)  $v_{i,j,t}, h_{i,j,t}$  are not covered by segments from **VER** or **HOR**;
- 998 (2) segment  $(v_{i,j,t}, h_{i,j,t})$  is in solution  $\mathcal{R}$ ;
- 999 (3)  $\text{order}(t) \in f(i, j)$ , that is,  $\text{order}(t)$  is an allowed tile for  $(i, j)$ ;
- 1000 (4) for every  $1 \leq s \leq n^2$ ,  $s \neq t$ ,  $v_{i,j,s}$  is covered in **VER**;
- 1001 (5) for every  $1 \leq s \leq n^2$ ,  $s \neq t$ ,  $h_{i,j,s}$  is covered in **HOR**.

1002 *Proof.* At most one of the points  $\{h_{i,j,t_x} : 1 \leq t_x \leq n^2\}$  and one of the points  $\{v_{i,j,t_y} : 1 \leq$   
 1003  $t_y \leq n^2\}$  is covered with **DIAG** (Claim 5.2).

1004 Moreover, exactly one such point  $h_{i,j,t_x}$  and one such point  $v_{i,j,t_y}$  is covered with **DIAG**,  
 1005 because if none of them were covered, then the solution would have to have weight at least  
 1006  $W_{\text{hv}} + 2\epsilon$  (see the proof of Lemma 5.3), which is more than  $W_{\text{hv}} + k^2\delta$ .

1007 We observe that points  $h_{i,j,t_x}$  and  $v_{i,j,t_y}$  have to be covered with the same segment from  
 1008 **DIAG**. Indeed we need to use at least  $k^2$  of them to use exactly one **DIAG** segment for every  
 1009 pair of  $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ , if we used 2 segments from **DIAG** for one pair  $(i, j)$ , then we would have  
 1010 used total weight at least  $W_{\text{hv}} + k^2\delta + \delta$  (Lemma 5.3), which is more than  $W_{\text{hv}} + k^2\delta$ . Since  
 1011 points  $h_{i,j,t_x}$  and  $v_{i,j,t_y}$  are covered by a single segment from **DIAG**, we have  $t_x = t_y$ .

1012 Therefore  $t_x = t_y$  and  $\text{order}(t_x)$  is an allowed tile for  $(i, j)$  because the corresponding  
 1013 segment is in **DIAG**.  $\square$

1014 We refer to the function mapping  $1 \leq x \leq k$  to  $t_x$  from Lemma 5.4 as **diagonal** :  $\{1 \dots k\} \times$   
 1015  $\{1 \dots k\} \rightarrow \{1 \dots n^2\}$ .

1016 **Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be any solution of a constructed instance  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w, 3k^2 + 2k)$  with weight*  
 1017 *at most  $W_{\text{hv}} + k^2\delta$ . Then:*

- 1018 1. for any  $1 \leq i < k, 1 \leq j \leq k$ ,  $\text{match}_h(\text{diagonal}(i, j), \text{diagonal}(i + 1, j))$  is **true**;
- 1019 2. for any  $1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j < k$ ,  $\text{match}_v(\text{diagonal}(i, j), \text{diagonal}(i, j + 1))$  is **true**.

1020 *Proof.* We prove (1) by contradiction, the proof of (2) is analogous.

1021 Let us take any  $1 \leq i < k, 1 \leq j \leq k$  and name  $t_1 = \text{diagonal}(i, j)$  and  $t_2 = \text{diagonal}(i +$   
 1022  $1, j)$ . We also assume that  $\text{match}_h(t_1, t_2)$  is **false**, which is equivalent to the fact that segment  
 1023  $(h_{i,j,t_1}^R, h_{i+1,j,t_2}^L)$  is not in set **HOR**.

1024 Therefore  $h_{i,j,t_1}$  and  $h_{i+1,j,t_2}$  are not covered by segments from **HOR** (Lemma 5.4), while  
 1025  $h_{i,j,t_1}^R$  and  $h_{i+1,j,t_2}^L$  have to be covered by segments from **HOR** (Claim 5.1).

1026 Every segment from **HOR** either:

- 1027 • starts at point  $h_{x,y,z_1}^R$  and ends at point  $h_{x+1,y,z_2}^L$  for some  $1 \leq x < k, 1 \leq y \leq k$  and  
 1028  $1 \leq z_1, z_2 \leq n^2$ ; or
- 1029 • is  $\text{horBeg}_{y,z}$  and starts at  $h_{1,y,1}^L$  and ends at  $h_{1,y,n^2}^L$  for some  $1 \leq y \leq k$  and  $1 \leq z \leq n^2$ ;  
 1030 or
- 1031 • is  $\text{horEnd}_{y,z}$  and starts at  $h_{k,y,z}^R$  and ends at  $h_{k,y,n^2}^R$  for some  $1 \leq y \leq k$  and  $1 \leq z \leq n^2$ .

1032 All of the points between  $h_{i,j,t_1}^R$  and  $h_{i+1,j,t_2}^L$  are covered by segments in **HOR** and there is no  
 1033 segment  $(h_{i,j,t_1}^R, h_{i+1,j,t_2}^L)$  in **HOR**. Hence, there are at least two different segments covering  
 1034 them. If both of these segments are neither  $\text{horBeg}_{y,z}$  nor  $\text{horEnd}_{y,z}$ , then one of them must  
 1035 begin at  $h_{i,j,t_1}^R$  and end at  $h_{i+1,j,z_2}^L$  and there must be other one that begins at  $h_{i,j,z_1}^R$  and ends  
 1036 at  $h_{i+1,j,t_2}^L$  for some  $1 \leq z_1, z_2 \leq n^2$ .

1037 Thus, the space between  $h_{i,j,z_1}^R$  and  $h_{i,j+1,z_2}^L$  would be covered twice and is longer than  $\epsilon$ .  
 1038 The case when one of them is  $\text{horBeg}_{y,z}$  or  $\text{horEnd}_{y,z}$  is analogous. Note that they cannot be  
 1039 both  $\text{horBeg}_{y,z}$  or  $\text{horEnd}_{y,z}$ .

1040 By the proof of Lemma 5.3, the lower bound for weight of such a solution is  $W_{\text{hv}} + \epsilon$  which  
 1041 is more than  $W_{\text{hv}} + k^2\delta$ .

1042 Therefore  $h_{i,j,t_1}^R$  and  $h_{i+1,j,t_2}^L$  must be covered by one segment from **HOR**, namely  $(h_{i,j,t_1}^R, h_{i+1,j,t_2}^L)$ .  
 1043 Hence  $(h_{i,j,t_1}^R, h_{i+1,j,t_2}^L)$  is a segment in **HOR** and  $\text{match}_h(t_1, t_2)$  is **true**.  $\square$

1044 **Lemma 5.6.** *If there exists a solution to instance  $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, w, 3k^2 + 2k)$  with weight at most*  
 1045  *$W_{\text{hv}} + k^2\delta$ , then there exists a solution to the grid tiling instance  $(f_{i,j})$ .*

1046 *Proof.* Take **diagonal** function from Lemma 5.4.

1047 To define the  $x$  function for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$  set  $x(i) := x_i$  where  $(x_i, a) = \text{order}(v_{i,1})$ .  
 1048 Similarly, to define the  $y$  function, for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$  set  $y(i) := y_i$  where  $(b, y_i) = \text{order}(h_{1,i})$

1049 To prove that this is a correct solution to grid tiling, we need to prove that for every  
 1050  $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ ,  $(x(i), y(j))$  is in the allowed tiles set  $f(i, j)$ .

1051 Let us take any  $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ . By Lemma 5.5 and simple induction, we know that  
 1052  $\text{match}_h(\text{diagonal}(1, j), \text{diagonal}(i, j))$  and  $\text{match}_v(\text{diagonal}(i, 1), \text{diagonal}(i, j))$  are **true**. There-  
 1053 fore  $\text{order}(\text{diagonal}(i, j)) = (x(i), y(j))$ . By Lemma 5.4 we know that  $\text{order}(\text{diagonal}(i, j))$  is in  
 1054  $f(i, j)$ . Therefore  $(x(i), y(j))$  is in  $f(i, j)$ .  $\square$

# Bibliography

- [Adamaszek et al., 2015] Adamaszek, A., Chalermsook, P., and Wiese, A. (2015). How to tame rectangles: Solving independent set and coloring of rectangles via shrinking. In Garg, N., Jansen, K., Rao, A., and Rolim, J. D. P., editors, *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques, APPROX/RANDOM 2015, August 24-26, 2015, Princeton, NJ, USA*, volume 40 of *LIPICs*, pages 43–60. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- [Chan and Grant, 2014] Chan, T. M. and Grant, E. (2014). Exact algorithms and approximation hardness results for geometric packing and covering problems. *Comput. Geom.*, 47(2):112–124.
- [Cygan et al., 2015] Cygan, M., Fomin, F. V., Kowalik, L., Lokshtanov, D., Marx, D., Pilipczuk, M., Pilipczuk, M., and Saurabh, S. (2015). *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer.
- [Dinur and Steurer, 2014] Dinur, I. and Steurer, D. (2014). Analytical approach to parallel repetition. In Shmoys, D. B., editor, *Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2014, New York, NY, USA, May 31 - June 03, 2014*, pages 624–633. ACM.
- [Etscheid et al., 2017] Etscheid, M., Kratsch, S., Mnich, M., and Röglin, H. (2017). Polynomial kernels for weighted problems. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 84:1–10.
- [Gaspers et al., 2012] Gaspers, S., Kim, E. J., Ordyniak, S., Saurabh, S., and Szeider, S. (2012). Don’t be strict in local search! In Hoffmann, J. and Selman, B., editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, July 22-26, 2012, Toronto, Ontario, Canada*. AAAI Press.
- [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.
- [Kim et al., 2021] Kim, E. J., Kratsch, S., Pilipczuk, M., and Wahlström, M. (2021). Directed flow-augmentation. *CoRR*, abs/2111.03450.
- [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, 2007] Marx, D. (2007). On the optimality of planar and geometric approximation schemes. In *48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2007), October 20-23, 2007, Providence, RI, USA, Proceedings*, pages 338–348. IEEE Computer Society.

- 1089 [Marx and Pilipczuk, 2015] Marx, D. and Pilipczuk, M. (2015). Optimal parameterized algo-  
1090 rithms for planar facility location problems using voronoi diagrams. *CoRR*, abs/1504.05476.
- 1091 [Marx and Schlotter, 2011] Marx, D. and Schlotter, I. (2011). Stable assignment with couples:  
1092 Parameterized complexity and local search. *Discret. Optim.*, 8(1):25–40.
- 1093 [Mustafa et al., 2014] Mustafa, N. H., Raman, R., and Ray, S. (2014). Settling the apx-  
1094 hardness status for geometric set cover. In *55th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations  
1095 of Computer Science, FOCS 2014, Philadelphia, PA, USA, October 18-21, 2014*, pages  
1096 541–550. IEEE Computer Society.
- 1097 [Mustafa and Ray, 2010] Mustafa, N. H. and Ray, S. (2010). Improved results on geometric  
1098 hitting set problems. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 44(4):883–895.
- 1099 [Pilipczuk et al., 2016] Pilipczuk, M., van Leeuwen, E. J., and Wiese, A. (2016). Approxima-  
1100 tion and parameterized algorithms for geometric independent set with shrinking. *CoRR*,  
1101 abs/1611.06501.
- 1102 [Pilipczuk et al., 2020] Pilipczuk, M., van Leeuwen, E. J., and Wiese, A. (2020). Quasi-  
1103 polynomial time approximation schemes for packing and covering problems in planar  
1104 graphs. *Algorithmica*, 82(6):1703–1739.
- 1105 [Shachnai and Zehavi, 2017] Shachnai, H. and Zehavi, M. (2017). A multivariate framework  
1106 for weighted FPT algorithms. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 89:157–189.
- 1107 [Wiese, 2018] Wiese, A. (2018). Independent set of convex polygons: From  $n^\epsilon$  to  $1 + \epsilon$  via  
1108 shrinking. *Algorithmica*, 80(3):918–934.