

# Assignment 1 - Convex Hull and Plane Sweep Algorithm

Duy Pham - 0980384  
Mazen Aly - 0978251  
Pattarawat Chormai - 0978675

November 15, 2015

## 1

---

**Algorithm 1** SmallConvexHull

---

**Require:** set of points  $P$

**if**  $|P| < 5$  **then**

    return true

**end if**

Find  $P_1, P_2$ , the left-most and the right-most points from  $P$

Find  $P_3 \in P$ , which is the farthest point from the line  $P_1P_2$

Find  $P_4 \in P$ , which is the farthest point from the triangle  $P_1P_2P_3$  and outside the triangle region.

**if**  $P_4$  does not exist **then**

    return true

**end if**

**if** One point in  $P$  is outside the polygon  $P_1P_2P_3P_4$  **then**

    return false

**end if**

return true

---

*Proof.* We will prove that the algorithm returns the correct result.

The convex hull covers all of the points in the set  $(P)$ , by definition. Therefore, it covers the left-most and the right-most points; so  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  belong to the resulting convex hull of the set  $P$ .

$P_3$  is the farthest point from the line  $P_1P_2$ . If  $P_3$  does not belong to the convex hull, then the convex hull does not cover  $P_3$ . It contradicts the definition of the convex hull. Thus,  $P_3$  must belong to the convex hull.

Similarly,  $P_4$  is the farthest point from the triangle  $P_1P_2P_3$ , which means  $P_4$  must belong to the convex hull.

If in the set  $P$ , there is a point outside of the polygon  $P_1P_2P_3P_4$ , then we need more points to construct the convex hull because these 4 points are proven to be in the resulting convex hull. Thus, the convex hull contains more than 4 vertices. Otherwise, the convex hull obviously contains less than 5 vertices.

Therefore, the algorithm is correct.

Now, we will prove that the algorithm runs in  $O(n)$  time.

For finding  $P_i, 1 \leq i \leq 4$ , it takes  $O(n)$  time.

For checking that if any point is outside of the polygon, it takes  $O(n)$  time.

Therefore, the overall time complexity is  $O(n)$ . □

### 3

#### (a)

Our rectangle is a region of  $2\delta \times \delta$ .

Because  $\delta$  is the smallest diameter among all three-disks, then the maximum distance among any three points must be at least some constant factor of  $\delta$ . (Indeed, if the three points create an equilateral triangle, then the distance is  $\frac{\sqrt{3}\delta}{2}$ . If the third point is very close to the line created from the

first 2 points, then the maximum distance is  $\delta$ ).

Now we try to put as many points as possible into the rectangle region, following the rule: there are no three-disks with diameters less than  $\delta$ . It is obvious that we have to put the points at a smallest possible distance to each other.

To maximize the number of the points, we will put the first point  $P_1$  in the center of the left border of the rectangle. Then we can insert the next point  $P_2$  at a very close position to  $P_1$  (much smaller than  $\delta$ ). Then the next point  $P_3$  must be at least at a distance of  $\delta$  from either  $P_1$  or  $P_2$ . There is also the other case when we put  $P_2, P_3$  in which  $P_1P_2P_3$  forms an equilateral triangle, and the distance of the edges is  $\frac{\sqrt{3}\cdot\delta}{2}$ . If we put any other point, there will be 3 points that create a smaller disk.

Similarly, we do the same thing for the other half of the rectangle, however we have to take care of the situation when there are 3 points close to the center of the rectangle which can form a smaller three-disk.

Therefore, the number of points in the rectangle is bounded by a constant.

**(b)**

In this algorithm, we use array for  $Q$  and a Binary Search Tree for  $S$ .

The algorithm returns the correct solution. If there is a smaller three-disk in the set of points, it should be covered when the sweep line scans through the lowest point among the three, and  $\delta$  will be updated.

Instead of comparing every combination, it scans from the top point to the bottom point and update the smallest three-disk at each step. At each step, the number of combinations needed to find a new diameter is a constant because the numbers of points inside the rectangle of size  $2\delta \times \delta$  is bounded by a constant, as being proven in part (a).

The cost of sorting the events is  $O(n \log n)$ .

---

**Algorithm 2** PaneSweepThree-Disk

---

**Require:** set of points  $P$

Initialize  $Q$  an event queue and  $S$  a status data structure storing  $p_{i.x}$  and  $\delta \leftarrow 0$

Sort  $P$  in  $y$  value in descending order and put it into  $Q$

Construct the first three-disk from  $p_1, p_2$  and  $p_3$  and update  $\delta$

**for**  $p_i \in P$  where  $3 < i < n$  **do**

    Remove  $p_j$  from  $S$  where  $p_{j.y} > \delta + p_{i.y}$

    Add  $p_{i.x}$  to  $S$

    Find  $R$ , a set of points whose  $x$  value is in the range  $[p_{i.x} - \delta, p_{i.x} + \delta]$  from  $S$

**if**  $|R| > 1$  **then**

            Find a smaller three-disk by trying all combination of  $R \cup \{p_i\}$  and update  $\delta$

**end if**

**end for**

report  $\delta$

---

For each of the event point, each removal from the  $S$  takes constant time, the insertion also takes  $O(\log n)$  time, the extraction of the values inside the rectangle depends on the number of items inside that range - which is bounded by a constant as being proven above.

So in the normal case, the algorithm runs in  $O(n \log n)$  time.

The degenerate case is when most of the points ( $O(n)$ ) are inside the range  $\delta$ , then the removal is costly. In such a case, it takes  $O(n)$  to remove every item above the range of  $\delta$ . Then the algorithm runs in  $O(n^2)$  time.