

APPROXIMATING THE SMALLEST k -ENCLOSING GEODESIC DISC IN A SIMPLE POLYGON*

Prosenjit Bose,[†] Anthony D’Angelo,[‡] Stephane Durocher[§]

ABSTRACT.

We consider the problem of finding a geodesic disc of smallest radius containing at least k points from a set of n points in a simple polygon that has m vertices, r of which are reflex vertices. We refer to such a disc as a SKEG disc. We present an algorithm to compute a SKEG disc using higher-order geodesic Voronoi diagrams with worst-case time $O(k^2n + k^2r + \min(kr, r(n - k)) + m)$ ignoring polylogarithmic factors.

We then present two 2-approximation algorithms that find a geodesic disc containing at least k points whose radius is at most twice that of a SKEG disc. The first algorithm computes a 2-approximation with high probability in $O((n^2/k) \log n \log r + m)$ worst-case time with $O(n + m)$ space. The second algorithm runs in $O(n \log^2 n \log r + m)$ expected time using $O(n + m)$ expected space, independent of k . Note that the first algorithm is faster when $k \in \omega(n/\log n)$.

KEYWORDS:

Minimum / smallest enclosing circle / disc · Geodesic · Simple polygon · 2-approximation · Computational geometry · SKEG disc · 2-SKEG disc

1 Introduction

The *smallest enclosing disc* problem¹ takes as input a set S of n points in the plane and returns the smallest Euclidean disc that contains S . This can be solved in $O(n)$ expected time [56] and $O(n)$ worst-case time [44]. The *smallest k -enclosing disc* problem is a generalization that asks for a smallest disc that contains at least $k \leq |S|$ points² of S , for any given k , and has been well-studied [3, 25, 28, 29, 33, 42, 43]. It is conjectured that an exact algorithm that computes the smallest k -enclosing disc in the plane requires $\Omega(nk)$ time [32, §1.5].

*This research was funded in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC). A preliminary version of this paper appeared in WADS 2023 [16]. A full version of this paper also appeared as a chapter in Anthony D’Angelo’s thesis [24]. This paper has undergone minor corrections since publication.

[†]*School of Computer Science, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada, jit@scs.carleton.ca*

[‡]*Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada, anthony.dangelo@carleton.ca*

[§]*University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada, stephane.durocher@umanitoba.ca*

¹Also known as the *minimum enclosing disc* or *minimum enclosing circle* problem.

²In this paper, we use the notation $|Z|$ to denote the number of points in Z if Z is a point set, or the number of vertices of Z if Z is a face or a polygon.

Agarwal et al. [3] gave an algorithm to find a set of k points in S with minimum diameter (i.e., the selected set minimizes the maximum distance between any two points in the set, which differs from the smallest k -enclosing disc) in $O(k^{5/2}n \log k + n \log n)$ time. Efrat, Sharir, and Ziv [28] used parametric search to compute the smallest k -enclosing disc using $O(nk)$ space in $O(nk \log^2 n)$ time, and using $O(n \log n)$ space in $O(nk \log^2 n \log(n/k))$ time. Eppstein and Erickson [29] showed how to compute a smallest k -enclosing disc in $O(n \log n + nk \log k)$ time using $O(n \log n + nk + k^2 \log k)$ space. Datta et al. [25] were able to improve on the result of Eppstein and Erickson by reducing the space to $O(n + k^2 \log k)$.

Matoušek [42] presented an algorithm that first computes a constant-factor approximation³ in $O(n \log n)$ time and $O(n)$ space (recently improved to $O(n)$ expected-time for a 2-approximation that uses $O(n)$ expected space [33]), and then uses that approximation to seed an algorithm for solving the problem exactly in $O(n \log n + nk)$ expected time using $O(nk)$ space (which Datta et al. [25] improved to $O(n + k^2)$ space) or $O(n \log n + nk \log k)$ expected time using $O(n)$ space (recently improved to $O(nk)$ expected time using $O(n + k^2)$ expected space [25, 33]). Matoušek [43] also presented an algorithm for computing the smallest disc that contains all but at most q of n points in $O(n \log n + q^3 n^\epsilon)$ time for ϵ “a positive constant that can be made arbitrarily small by adjusting the parameters of the algorithms; multiplicative constants in the $O()$ notation may depend on ϵ ” [43].

In this paper we generalize the smallest k -enclosing disc problem to simple polygons using the *geodesic metric*. This means the Euclidean distance function has been replaced by the *geodesic distance* function. The *geodesic distance* between two points a and b in a simple polygon P is the length of the shortest path between a and b that lies completely inside P . When P is a simple polygon with a finite set of vertices, a shortest path from a to b in P is a polyline whose length is the sum of the Euclidean lengths of its edges. Let this shortest path starting at a and ending at b be denoted $\Pi(a, b)$ and let its length be denoted as $d_g(a, b)$. For any two points a and b of P , the vertices on $\Pi(a, b)$ are either a , b , or reflex vertices of P [9, 22, 37]. A *geodesic disc* $D(c, \rho)$ of radius ρ centred at $c \in P$ is the set of all points in P whose geodesic distance to c is at most ρ . The main focus of our article is the following problem.

Smallest k -Enclosing Geodesic (*SKEG*) Disc Problem

Consider a simple polygon P_{in} defined by a sequence of m vertices in \mathbb{R}^2 , r of which are reflex vertices, and a set S of n points of \mathbb{R}^2 contained in P_{in} .⁴ Find a *SKEG disc*, i.e., a geodesic disc of minimum radius ρ^* in P_{in} that contains at least k points of S .

We make the general position assumptions that no two points of S are equidistant to a vertex of P_{in} , and no four points of S are geodesically co-circular. Under these assumptions, a SKEG disc contains exactly k points. Let $D(c^*, \rho^*)$ be a SKEG disc for the points of S in P_{in} . For convenience, at times we will refer to this as simply D^* . A k -enclosing geodesic disc (*KEG disc*) is a geodesic disc in P_{in} that contains exactly k points of S . A 2-SKEG

³ A β -approximation means that the disc returned has a radius at most β times the radius of an optimal solution.

⁴ When we refer to a point p being in a polygon P , we mean that p is in the interior of P or on the boundary, ∂P .

disc is a KEG disc with radius at most $2\rho^*$ (i.e., it is a 2-approximation). The main result of our article is the following theorem.

Theorem 4. *If $k \in O(n/\log n)$, **Main- Algo** computes a 2-SKEG disc in expected time $O(n \log^2 n \log r + m)$ and expected space $O(n + m)$, independent of k ; if $k \in \omega(n/\log n)$, **Main- Algo** computes a 2-SKEG disc with high probability⁵ in $O((n^2/k) \log n \log r + m)$ deterministic time with $O(n + m)$ space.*

1.1 Related Work

We are not aware of other work tackling the subject of this paper, but below we highlight related work on geodesic discs in polygons.

A region Q is *geodesically convex* relative to a polygon P if for all points $u, v \in Q$, the geodesic shortest path from u to v in P is in Q . The *geodesic convex hull* CH_g of a set of points S in a polygon P is the intersection of all geodesically convex regions in P that contain S . The geodesic convex hull of n points in a simple m -gon can be computed in $O(n \log(mn) + m)$ time (or $O(n \log(mn))$ time once the shortest-path data structure of Guibas and Hershberger [30, 35] is built) using $O(n + m)$ space [30, 52]. The expression of the runtime can be simplified to $O(n \log n + m)$ using the following argument [38, 46, 55]. If $n \leq m/\log m$, then we have $n \log m \leq (m/\log m) \log m = m$. If $m/\log m < n$, then we have $\log(m/\log m) < \log n$ which implies that $\log m$ is $O(\log n)$.

The *geodesic centre* problem asks for a smallest enclosing geodesic disc that lies in the polygon and encloses all vertices of the polygon (stated another way, a point that minimizes the geodesic distance to the farthest point). This problem is well-studied [4, 11, 17, 50, 52] and can be solved in $O(m)$ time and space [4]. The geodesic centre for polygonal domains⁶ has also been studied [12, 54] and can be solved in $O(m^{11} \log m)$ time [54]. The geodesic centre problem for simple polygons has been generalized to the geodesic j -centre problem⁷ where we seek a set of j geodesic discs of minimum radii such that all vertices of the simple polygon are contained in some disc, though only $j = 2$ has been studied so far [49, 53]. The current best algorithm by Oh et al. [49] runs in $O(m^2 \log^2 m)$ time and $O(m)$ space. The geodesic j -centre problem has been generalized to finding the geodesic j -centre of a set of points S inside a simple polygon, though we still only have results for $j = 1$ and $j = 2$. For $j = 1$, the problem can be solved by finding the geodesic centre of the weakly simple polygon formed by the geodesic convex hull of the point set S [10], and thus runs in $O(n \log n + m)$ time. For this approach, computing the solution is dominated by the time to compute CH_g . Oh et al. [48] recently gave an algorithm for $j = 2$ that runs in $O(n(m + n) \log^3(m + n))$ time. There is also the notion of the *geodesic edge centre* of a simple polygon (which is a point in the polygon that minimizes the maximum geodesic distance to any edge of the

⁵ We say an event happens with high probability if the probability is at least $1 - n^{-\lambda}$ for some constant λ .

⁶ As defined in Bae et al. [12], a *polygonal domain* with h holes and m corners is a connected and closed subset of \mathbb{R}^2 having h holes whose boundary consists of $h + 1$ simple closed polygonal chains of m total line segments.

⁷ The j -centre problem in the Euclidean plane, and thus also in our geodesic setting, is NP-hard [45].

polygon) for which Lubiw and Naredla have presented a linear-time algorithm to compute [41].

Vigan [53] has worked on packing and covering a simple polygon with geodesic discs. He provides a 2-approximation for the maximum cardinality packing of geodesic unit discs in simple polygons in $O(Y(m+Y)\log^2(m+Y))$ time, where Y is the output size, and shows that finding a packing of geodesic unit discs is NP-hard in polygons with holes; he shows that a minimum-size covering of a polygon with holes using geodesic unit discs is NP-hard; he shows that covering a polygon using j geodesic discs whose maximal radius is minimized is NP-hard and provides a 2-approximation algorithm that runs in $O(j^2(m+j)\log(m+j))$ time; he shows that packing j geodesic discs whose minimum radius is maximized into a polygon is NP-hard and gives an $O(j^2(m+j)\log(m+j))$ -time 4-approximation algorithm; lastly, he gives an $O(m^8 \log m)$ -time exact algorithm for covering a simple polygon with two geodesic discs of minimum maximal radius.

Rabanca and Vigan [51] worked on covering the boundary of a simple polygon with the minimum number of geodesic unit discs and gave an $O(m \log^2 m + j)$ -time 2-approximation algorithm, where j is the number of discs, and they also showed that if the perimeter L of the polygon is such that $L \geq m^{1+\delta}$, $\delta > 0$, then a simple $O(m)$ -time algorithm achieves an approximation ratio that goes to 1 as L/m goes to infinity.

Borgelt, van Kreveld, and Luo [15] studied geodesic discs in simple polygons to solve the following clustering problem: given a set S of n points inside a simple polygon P with m vertices, determine all subsets of S of size at least k for which a point q in P exists that has geodesic distance at most ρ to all points in the subset. The input parameters are k and ρ . They solve their problem by generating the boundaries of radius- ρ geodesic discs centred at the points of S and finding points that lie in at least k discs. They provide an output-sensitive algorithm to compute the set of geodesic discs centred at the point sites with the given radius that runs in $O((m + (Ym)^{(2/3)} + Y) \log^c m)$ time for some constant c and output size Y . With m vertices of the polygon and n input points, each of the n discs could have $O(m)$ arcs/pieces due to reflex vertices as well as the edges of the polygon that contain points closer than ρ to the centre. Thus, the upper bound on Y is $O(nm)$. After computing the boundaries of the discs individually, they then build the arrangement of the discs, count the depth of a cell of the arrangement, then traverse the arrangement updating the depth as they enter new cells. The runtime to solve the clustering problem also comes to depend on the number of intersections in the arrangement, which is $O(Y + n^2)$ [15]. The runtime becomes $O((m + (Ym)^{(2/3)} + Y) \log^c m + Y \log Y + n^2)$.

Dynamic k -nearest neighbour queries were studied by de Berg and Staals [26]. They presented a static data structure for geodesic k -nearest neighbour queries for n sites in a simple m -gon that is built in $O(n(\log n \log^2 m + \log^3 m))$ expected time using $O(n \log n \log m + m)$ expected space and answers queries in $O(\log(n+m) \log m + k \log m)$ expected time.⁸

If P_{in} has no reflex vertices, it is a convex polygon and the SKEG disc problem is solved by the algorithm for planar instances which uses a grid-refinement strategy. This

⁸ We note that depending on the relations of the values m , r , and n to each other, there may be situations in which our algorithms may be improved by polylogarithmic factors by using the k -nearest neighbour query data structure. Details of these trade-offs are discussed in Section 5.1.

works in the plane because \mathbb{R}^2 with the Euclidean metric, $d_e(\cdot, \cdot)$, is a doubling metric space, meaning that for any point c in the space \mathbb{R}^2 and any radius $\rho > 0$, the closed disc $B(c, \rho) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^2 : d_e(u, c) \leq \rho\}$ can be covered with the union of $O(1)$ closed discs of radius $\rho/2$ [34] (i.e., unlike the geodesic metric, the Euclidean metric has *bounded doubling dimension*). The advantage of bounded doubling dimension to the gridding strategy is that a cell of the grid has a constant number of neighbours that need to be considered when processing the cell, allowing us to locate $O(k)$ candidate neighbour points when processing a point [32, 33]. It is straightforward to prove (using an example such as the one in Fig. 7 from Appendix A) that the geodesic metric does not have bounded doubling dimension (its doubling dimension is $\Theta(r)$ in a simple polygon with r reflex vertices). Thus, it is not clear whether a gridding strategy can be used with the geodesic metric to get efficient algorithms. The straightforward adaptation to simple polygons of the expected linear-time approximation algorithm that relies on grids [33] no longer seems to run in expected linear time; in a simple polygon with r reflex vertices, a given cell of a traditional grid approach could have $\Omega(r)$ neighbours to be considered when processing a cell, and it is not straightforward to process a cell that contains a reflex vertex.

Another difficulty of the geodesic metric is that for two points u and v of S on opposite sides of a given chord, their geodesic bisector (formed by concatenating their bisector and hyperbolic arcs) can cross the chord more than once. See Figs. 8 to 10 in Appendix B.

1.2 An Exact Algorithm

In this section we present an exact algorithm for the SKEG disc problem that uses higher-order geodesic Voronoi diagrams to find the exact solution. Omitted details appear in Appendix C.

Rather than working with our m -gon, we use the polygon simplification algorithm of Aichholzer et al. [5] to transform P_{in} into a simple polygon $P \supseteq P_{in}$ of size $O(r)$ in $O(m)$ time and space such that P preserves the visibility of points in P_{in} , as well as their shortest paths. The reflex vertices in P_{in} also appear in P . We again assume that S is in general position with respect to P . The polygon simplification allows the running time of the algorithm to depend on the number of *reflex* vertices of P_{in} rather than the total number of vertices of P_{in} . Thus, the algorithm runs faster on polygons with fewer reflex vertices.

For $k \leq n - 1$ we use the shortest-path data structure of Guibas and Hershberger [30, 35]. This shortest-path data structure can be built in $O(r)$ time and space (since we have linear-time polygon triangulation algorithms [7, 20]) and, given any two query points in the polygon, returns a tree of $O(\log r)$ height in $O(\log r)$ time representing the shortest path between the two query points as well as the length of this path. The in-order traversal of this tree gives the shortest path. The data structure uses additional $O(\log r)$ space to build the result of the query (i.e., the tree) by linking together precomputed structures. Given the result of a query, we can perform a search through this tree to find the midpoint of the shortest path in $O(\log r)$ time [55, Lemma 3], or traverse the resulting tree to a leaf to get the first or last edge of the path in $O(\log r)$ time.

Higher-order Voronoi diagrams have been considered to solve the smallest k -enclosing

disc problem in the plane [3, 28]. This approach can be generalized to a point set S contained in simple polygons, but it requires computing the order- k geodesic Voronoi diagram (OKGVD),⁹ or the order- $(k-1)$ and order- $(k-2)$ diagrams.

The order-1 and the order- $(n-1)$ geodesic Voronoi diagrams (a.k.a., the *nearest-point* and *farthest-point* geodesic Voronoi diagrams, respectively) have complexity $\Theta(n+r)$ [9, 10]. There is an algorithm for the geodesic nearest-point Voronoi diagram that runs in $O(n \log n + r)$ time and uses $O(n \log n + r)$ space [46], and one for the farthest-point diagram that runs in $O(n \log n + r)$ time and uses $\Theta(n+r)$ space [13, 55].

Oh and Ahn [47] showed that the complexity of the OKGVD of n points in a simple r -gon is $\Theta(k(n-k) + \min(kr, r(n-k)))$. The fastest algorithms to compute the OKGVD are the one by Oh and Ahn [47] that runs in time $O(k^2 n \log n \log^2 r + \min(kr, r(n-k)))$, and the one by Liu and Lee [39] that runs in $O(k^2 n \log n + k^2 r \log r)$ time. They both use $\Omega(k(n-k) + \min(kr, r(n-k)))$ space (which is $\Omega(n+r)$ for constant k or k close to n and $\Omega(kn + kr) = \Omega(n^2 + nr)$ for k a constant fraction of n).

When using the order- k diagram to find a SKEG disc, the approach is to traverse the diagram and, for each face, compute the geodesic centre of the k points that define the face (either by using the approach of Oh and Ahn [47, Lemma 3.9], or by computing CH_g for the points and then computing the geodesic centre of CH_g). While computing the geodesic centre for the k points that define a face, we also find one of these k points farthest from this centre. As such, we can then get the radius of a SKEG disc for these points in $O(\log r)$ time using shortest-path queries. A solution to the SKEG disc problem is then the smallest of these discs.

Remark 1. Assuming general positioning, a SKEG disc has either two or three points of S on its boundary.

The second approach for computing a SKEG disc with geodesic Voronoi diagrams computes the order- $(k-1)$ and order- $(k-2)$ diagrams. If there are three points of S on the boundary of a SKEG disc, then the centre of a SKEG disc is a Voronoi vertex of the order- $(k-2)$ diagram and the radius is the geodesic distance from that Voronoi vertex to the points of S that define it. Given the order- $(k-2)$ diagram, we traverse it and compute a SKEG disc for the k points defining each Voronoi vertex in $O(\log r)$ time each (i.e., the three faces adjacent to a given Voronoi vertex will be defined by k distinct points of S , and the SKEG disc for those points will be the geodesic disc centred at the Voronoi vertex and whose radius is the distance to any one of the three points of S that defined the vertex). If there are two points of S on the boundary of a SKEG disc, then the centre of a SKEG disc lies along a Voronoi edge of the order- $(k-1)$ diagram, more specifically at the midpoint of the shortest path between the two points of S that defined the geodesic bisector defining the Voronoi edge. Given the order- $(k-1)$ diagram, we traverse it and compute a SKEG disc for the k points defining each Voronoi edge in $O(\log r)$ time each (i.e., the two faces adjacent to a given Voronoi edge will be defined by k distinct points of S , and the SKEG disc for those points will be the geodesic disc centred at the midpoint of the aforementioned shortest path

⁹ Stated briefly, the order- k Voronoi diagram is a generalization of the Voronoi diagram such that each face is the locus of points whose k nearest neighbours are the k points of S associated with (i.e., that define) the face.

and whose radius is half the length of said shortest path). The smallest computed disc is a SKEG disc for the points of S .

When $k = n - 1$, it is more efficient to use the order- k diagram to solve the SKEG disc problem. Otherwise, for $1 < k < n - 1$, it is more efficient to use the order- $(k - 1)$ and order- $(k - 2)$ diagrams to solve the SKEG disc problem.

Theorem 1. *Given an integer $1 < k \leq n$, a SKEG disc of the points of S can be computed in:*

| k | <i>Time</i> | <i>Space</i> |
|---------|---|---|
| n | $O(n \log n + m)$ | $\Theta(n + m)$ |
| $n - 1$ | if $k \log k \log^2 r \in O(r)$ • $O(nr \log n \log^2 r + m)$ else • $O(n^2 \log n + n^2 \log r + nr \log n + nr \log r + r^2 + m)$ | $\Theta(n + m)$ |
| 2 | $O(n \log n + r \log r + m)$ | $O(n \log n + m)$ |
| else | if $n \log n \log r \in O(r)$ • $O(k^2 n \log n \log^2 r + \min(rk, r(n - k)) \log r + m)$ else • $O(k^2 n \log n + k^2 r \log r + k(n - k) \log r + \min(kr, r(n - k)) \log r + m)$ | $\Omega(k(n - k))$ $+ \min(rk, r(n - k))$ $+ m$ |

Ignoring polylogarithmic factors, the worst-case runtime for $k = \{2, n\}$ is $O(n + m)$; for $k = n - 1$: if $k \log k \log^2 r \in O(r)$ is $O(nr + m)$, else, is $O(n^2 + nr + r^2 + m)$; for $k < n - 1$: if $n \log n \log r \in O(r)$ is $O(k^2 n + \min(rk, r(n - k)) + m)$, and $O(k^2 n + k^2 r + \min(kr, r(n - k)) + m)$ otherwise.

Proof. Omitted details appear in Appendix C.

When $k = n$, the SKEG disc problem is the same as the problem of computing the geodesic centre of a set of points inside a simple polygon.

We can use the order-1 geodesic Voronoi diagram when $k = 2$. Considering the preprocessing time, the construction time, and the time to traverse the diagram performing the appropriate $O(\log r)$ -time queries, we can solve the SKEG disc problem in $O(n \log n + r \log r + m)$ time (simplified from $O(n \log n + n \log r + r \log r + m)$).

The farthest-point geodesic Voronoi diagram is the same as the order- $(n - 1)$ diagram. When $k = n - 1$, it is more efficient to compute a SKEG disc using the farthest-point geodesic Voronoi diagram and, for each face, compute the geodesic centre of the $n - 1$ closest points. Oh and Ahn [47, Lemma 3.9] presented a method to find the geodesic centre of k points in $O(k \log k \log^2 r)$ time and $O(k + r)$ space. The other method for computing the appropriate geodesic centres is to first compute CH_g for the k points defining each face, and then compute the geodesic centre of the weakly simple polygon formed by the CH_g . The time for the Oh and Ahn approach (i.e., $O(k \log k \log^2 r)$) always dominates the time to compute CH_g (i.e., $O(k \log r + k \log k)$). Thus, the Oh and Ahn approach is only more efficient for computing the geodesic centres of the requisite points when its runtime is dominated by the time to compute the geodesic centre of CH_g . As has already been mentioned, the time to compute the geodesic centre of a weakly simple polygon is linear in its size. The size of CH_g

of the k points of S defining a face of the OKGVD is $O(r + k)$. Consequently, the Oh and Ahn [47, Lemma 3.9] approach is more efficient when $k \log k \log^2 r \in O(r)$. Performing this computation for each face of the OKGVD, we spend $O((r + n) \cdot k \log k \log^2 r)$ time over all faces and $O(r + n)$ space. Substituting $k = n - 1$, noting that $k \log k \log^2 r \in O(r)$ means $n \in O(r)$, and considering the preprocessing, the time we use is $O(nr \log n \log^2 r + m)$.

Otherwise, for $k = n - 1$ it is more efficient to compute CH_g of the k points of S associated with each face of the diagram to obtain weakly simple polygons, and then compute the geodesic centre of each of those geodesic convex hulls. We spend $O(r + n) \cdot O(k \log r + k \log k)$ time to compute CH_g of each subset of k points that defines a face; then we compute the geodesic centres in $O(r + n) \cdot O(r + k)$ time and $O(r + n)$ space. Substituting $k = n - 1$ and considering the preprocessing cost, the time used becomes $O(n^2 \log n + n^2 \log r + nr \log n + nr \log r + r^2 + m)$.

For $1 < k < n - 1$, it suffices to compute the order- $(k - 2)$ and order- $(k - 1)$ geodesic Voronoi diagrams and consider: the vertices of the order- $(k - 2)$ diagram; and the midpoints of the shortest paths between the points defining edges shared by adjacent cells of the order- $(k - 1)$ diagram.

Oh and Ahn [47] showed that the complexity of the OKGVD of n points in a simple r -gon is $\Theta(k(n - k) + \min(kr, r(n - k)))$. The fastest algorithms to compute the OKGVD are the one by Oh and Ahn [47] that runs in time $O(k^2 n \log n \log^2 r + \min(kr, r(n - k)))$, and the one by Liu and Lee [39] that runs in $O(k^2 n \log n + k^2 r \log r)$ time. They both use $\Omega(k(n - k) + \min(kr, r(n - k)))$ space (which is $\Omega(n + r)$ for constant k or k close to n and $\Omega(kn + kr) = \Omega(n^2 + nr)$ for k a constant fraction of n). The algorithm of Oh and Ahn [47] is more efficient when $n \log n \log r \in O(r)$, which means the algorithm of Liu and Lee [39] is more efficient the rest of the time. Using shortest-path queries we traverse the diagrams in $O(k(n - k) + \min(kr, r(n - k))) \cdot O(\log r)$ time while comparing the candidates from the edges and vertices. Thus, for $n \log n \log r \in O(r)$, the time used including preprocessing is $O(k^2 n \log n \log^2 r + \min(kr, r(n - k)) \log r + m)$. Otherwise, the time including preprocessing is $O(k^2 n \log n + k^2 r \log r + k(n - k) \log r + \min(kr, r(n - k)) \log r + m)$. \square

The main result of our paper is an improvement in the runtime for computing a SKEG disc (Theorem 1), but it comes at the expense of a 2-approximation. This is summarized in Theorem 4. The runtime of Theorem 4 is derived by balancing the runtimes of two algorithms: **RS-Algo** (a random sampling algorithm described in Section 2) and **DI-Algo** (a Divide-and-Conquer algorithm described in Section 3).

Ignoring polylogarithmic factors, the expected runtime of the approximation algorithm of Theorem 4 is $O(n + m)$, matching the exact approach for $k = \{2, n\}$. The approximation algorithm of Theorem 4 is roughly expected to be faster by a factor of k or r for $k = n - 1$, and a factor of k^2 otherwise. For example, if $k \in \Omega(n)$ and $k < n - 1$, compare $O(n + m)$ to: $O(n^3 + r + m)$ for k close to n , or $O(n^3 + nr + m)$ for k a fraction of n ; and $O(n^3 + n^2 r + m)$.

Section 4 shows how to use a randomized iterative search as the merge step in Section 3 to compute a 2-approximation. We summarize our results in Section 5. Appendix A illustrates an example where the doubling dimension in the geodesic setting is proportional

to the number of reflex vertices of the simple polygon being considered; Appendix B provides an example where the geodesic bisector of two points in a simple polygon crosses a chord of that polygon multiple times; Appendix C provides omitted details detailing the exact algorithm that uses geodesic Voronoi diagrams (i.e., the approach described in this section) and the calculation of the runtimes presented in Theorem 1; Appendix D provides details omitted from the section describing the Divide-and-Conquer algorithm presented in this paper (i.e., the algorithm from Section 3); Appendix E provides details omitted from the discussion in Section 5.1 about using k -nearest neighbour queries in our algorithms; and Appendix F provides pseudocode for the algorithms described in the remainder of this paper.

2 Random Sampling Algorithm

In this section we present a random sampling algorithm to compute a 2-SKEG disc. Our first algorithm, **RS-Algo**, uses the following preprocessing (repeated for convenience).

Polygon Simplification Convert P_{in} into a simplified polygon P consisting of $O(r)$ vertices using the algorithm of Aichholzer et al. [5]. The algorithm runs in $O(m)$ time and space and computes a polygon P such that $P \supseteq P_{in}$, $|P|$ is $O(r)$, and the reflex vertices in P_{in} also appear in P . Furthermore, the shortest path between two points in P_{in} remains unchanged in P . As with P_{in} , we assume the points of S are in general position with the vertices of P , and no four points of S are geodesically co-circular in P .

Shortest-Path Data Structure We use the $O(r)$ -time and $O(r)$ -space algorithm of Guibas and Hershberger [30, 35] on P to build a data structure that gives the length of the shortest path between any two points in P in $O(\log r)$ time and space. Their algorithm runs in linear time since we have linear-time polygon triangulation algorithms [7, 20]. Querying the data structure with two points in P (i.e., a *source* and *destination*) returns a tree of $O(\log r)$ height whose in-order traversal is the shortest path in P between the two query points. The length of this path is returned with the tree, as is the length of the path from the source to each node along the path (which is stored at the respective node in the tree). The data structure uses additional $O(\log r)$ space to build the result of the query (i.e., the tree) by linking together precomputed structures. In addition to the length of the shortest path between two points, this data structure can provide the first or last edge along the path between the two points in $O(\log r)$ additional time by traversing the tree to a leaf.

This completes the preprocessing. The total time and space spent preprocessing is $O(m)$. The polygon simplification allows the running time of the algorithm to depend on the number of reflex vertices of P_{in} rather than its size. Thus, the algorithm runs faster on polygons with fewer reflex vertices. The shortest-path data structure allows us to quickly determine the geodesic distance between two points inside P . **RS-Algo** proceeds as follows: we repeatedly find the smallest KEG disc centred on the currently considered point of a computed random sample.

1. Compute a random sample of $(n/k) \ln(n)$ points of S .
2. For each point c in the random sample, find its $(k-1)^{\text{st}}$ -closest point in S using the geodesic distance.
3. Return the KEG disc of minimum computed radius.

Lemma 1. *RS- Algo chooses one of the k points of S contained in a SKEG disc D^* with probability at least $1 - n^{-1}$.*

Proof. Picking a point $c \in S$ uniformly at random, the probability that c is one of the k points of S in D^* is $P(c \in D^*) = k/n$, since each of the k points in D^* has probability $1/n$ of being chosen. Thus we have $P(c \notin D^*) = 1 - (k/n)$. The probability that none of the k points of S contained in D^* is chosen among the $(n/k) \ln(n)$ randomly chosen points is:

$$(1 - (k/n))^{(n/k) \ln(n)} \leq (e^{-(k/n)})^{(n/k) \ln(n)} = 1/n$$

Therefore, after selecting $(n/k) \ln(n)$ points of S uniformly at random, we will have chosen one of the k points of S in D^* with probability at least $1 - n^{-1}$. \square

Lemma 2. *RS- Algo computes a 2-SKEG disc if some point $c \in S$ in the random sample is one of the k points of S contained in a SKEG disc D^* .*

Proof. Let x be a point in D^* . By the definition of a disc, we have that $D^* \subset D(x, 2\rho^*)$. Therefore, the smallest geodesic disc centred at x containing k points has a radius that is at most twice ρ^* since D^* contains k points. \square

Having established Lemmas 1 and 2, we are ready to prove Theorem 2.

Theorem 2. *RS- Algo computes a 2-SKEG disc with probability at least $1 - n^{-1}$ in deterministic time $O((n^2/k) \log n \log r + m)$ using $O(n + m)$ space.*

Proof. We simplify our polygon P_{in} in $O(m)$ time and space [5]. We create our data structure for $O(\log r)$ -time shortest-path queries in $O(r)$ time and space [30, 35].

The runtime and space of the algorithm is dominated by the time and space used by the for-loop to compute the $(k-1)^{\text{st}}$ -closest neighbour of each of the $(n/k) \ln(n)$ points in the random sample. Since our preprocessing allows us to compute the distance between two arbitrary points in $O(\log r)$ time and space, the runtime for computing the $(k-1)^{\text{st}}$ -closest point of S for one point $c \in S$ in the random sample is $O(n \log r)$ and it uses $O(n + \log r)$ space. Indeed, in $O(n)$ time and space we create an array to store distances; next, we iterate over each of the $O(n)$ points in $S \setminus \{c\}$, calculate their distance to c in $O(\log r)$ time, and store the result in the next free space in our array; lastly, we need to extract the $(k-1)^{\text{st}}$ -smallest value from our array (this can be done using an $O(n)$ -time rank-finding algorithm [6, 14, 23]). Therefore the runtime of the for-loop is $O(((n/k) \ln(n)) \cdot n \log r) = O((n^2/k) \log n \log r)$ and the space is $O(n + \log r)$.

By Lemma 1, with probability at least $1 - n^{-1}$ we choose at least one of the k points of S from D^* to be in our random sample which, by Lemma 2, means that with probability at least $1 - n^{-1}$ **RS-Algo** will output a 2-approximation. \square

Remark 2. There is a simple deterministic algorithm that runs in $O(n^2 \log r + m)$ time by computing the $(k - 1)^{\text{st}}$ -closest neighbour for each point. However, we design a randomized algorithm, **RS-Algo**, that is faster when k is $\omega(\log n)$. Having a k term in the denominator of the runtime allows us to improve the runtime of our algorithm as k approaches n . When combining **RS-Algo** and **DI-Algo** (described in Section 3) and ignoring polylogarithmic factors, the runtime is at least a factor of $\Theta(n)$ faster than this simple approach.

It is worth pointing out that for $k \in \Omega(n)$, **RS-Algo** computes a 2-SKEG disc with high probability in $O(n \log n \log r + m)$ deterministic time using $O(n + m)$ space.

3 Divide-and-Conquer Algorithm

In this section we describe **DI-Algo**, a Divide-and-Conquer algorithm to compute a 2-SKEG disc. Omitted details appear in Appendix D.

Let D^* be a SKEG disc for the points of S in a polygon (the polygon being referred to will be clear from the context). In each recursive call, we split the current polygon by a diagonal into two subpolygons of roughly equal size and recursively compute a 2-SKEG disc for each of the two subpolygons. The merge step involves computing a 2-approximation to the optimal disc that contains k points under the assumption that the optimal disc intersects the diagonal used to generate the recursive calls. We delay discussion of the merge step until Section 4. **DI-Algo** requires the following preprocessing that constitutes **Preproc-Algo**. **Preproc-Algo** takes $O(n \log r + m)$ time and $O(n + m)$ space.

Simplification and Shortest-Path Data Structure Refer to Section 2.

Balanced Hierarchical Polygon Decomposition We compute a balanced hierarchical polygon decomposition tree T_B [21, 30, 31]. (Note that T_B is built by the shortest-path data structure.) We continually insert diagonals into our polygon until all faces subdividing it are triangles; each polygonal face f is split into two subpolygons of between $|f|/3$ and $2|f|/3$ vertices by a diagonal of f . Decomposing our simplified polygon, this takes $O(r)$ time and $O(r)$ space [19, 31]. We end up with a decomposition tree, based on a triangulation of our polygon, of $O(\log r)$ height whose leaves store the triangles. The internal nodes store the diagonals of the triangulation. A diagonal’s position in the tree corresponds to when it was inserted. We associate with each internal node the subpolygon split by the diagonal contained in the node (though we do not store this subpolygon in the node). The root is the initial polygon.

Point-Location Data Structure Recall that the leaves of T_B represent triangles in a triangulation of P . We build Kirkpatrick’s [20, 36] $O(\log r)$ query-time point-location data structure on these triangles in $O(r)$ time with $O(r)$ space.

Augment T_B for Point Location We augment T_B to store which points of S are in which subpolygon represented by the internal nodes of the tree.

Lemma 3. *In $O(n \log r + r)$ time and $O(n + r)$ space, we augment the decomposition tree T_B to know which points of S are in which subpolygon.*

Proof. Recall that the leaves of T_B represent triangles. Using Kirkpatrick’s [20, 36] $O(\log r)$ query-time point-location data structure built on these triangles in $O(r)$ time with $O(r)$ space, in $O(n \log r)$ time we then make a list of which points of S are in each triangle at the base of the decomposition tree. This can be done by storing a list in each triangle whose elements are the points in the triangle. When the point-location query returns a triangle for a given point of S , that point of S is appended to the end of the triangle’s list. Since there are n points of S , these lists take $O(n)$ space. We then do a post-order traversal of T_B in $O(n + r)$ time to determine how many points of S and which of them are in each subpolygon on either side of a given chord.¹⁰ This can be done by creating an array A of capacity n and inserting the points of S into A in the order that their triangle is seen in the post-order traversal (i.e., the left-to-right order of the leaves of T_B). The time spent copying the points from the lists in the triangles is $O(n)$. The leaves of T_B mark where their interval in A starts¹¹ and ends, and the internal nodes have three pointers dictating where their left child’s interval starts and ends, and where their right child’s interval starts and ends.¹² The interval of an internal node is from the beginning of its left child’s interval to the end of its right child’s. This takes $O(n)$ space for A and $O(1)$ space for each of the $O(r)$ nodes of the tree; therefore it takes $O(n + r)$ space (the point location queries take $O(1)$ space). \square

3.1 Algorithm Description: DI-Algo


Let τ denote the node of T_B associated with the current recursive call, let P_τ denote the current polygon split by the diagonal ℓ stored in τ , and let S_τ be the set of points of S in P_τ . For ease of discussion, we abuse notation and say P_τ is stored in τ . Recall that the root of T_B stores the initial polygon P . Let $|P_\tau| = r'$ and $|S_\tau| = n'$. Let P_1 (resp., P_2) be the subpolygon associated with the left (resp., right) child of τ on which we recurred that contains the points $S_1 \subseteq S$ (resp., $S_2 \subseteq S$). We also use the notation $P_1 \cup P_2$ to refer to P_τ .

The merge step (described in Section 4.1) involves computing $D(c, \rho)$, a KEG disc for $S_1 \cup S_2$ where the centre $c \in \ell$. If $D^* \cap S_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $D^* \cap S_2 \neq \emptyset$ (see Fig. 1a), then $D^* \cap \ell \neq \emptyset$ (as in Fig. 1b) and either the specially-chosen centre c returned from the merge step is inside $D^* \cap \ell$ (implying a 2-approximation), or $D(c, \rho)$ has a radius smaller than a disc centred on such a point (also implying a 2-approximation). If either $D^* \cap S_1 = \emptyset$ or $D^* \cap S_2 = \emptyset$, then the optimal disc is centred in one of the subpolygons and contains only points of S in that subpolygon, thus we have a 2-approximation by recursion. Therefore, the smallest disc computed among the three discs (i.e., the two discs returned by the recursion

¹⁰ The two subpolygons being considered are those whose union results in the subpolygon split by the insertion of the chord (i.e., the subpolygon we associate with the diagonal’s node in T_B).

¹¹ They will know where their interval starts by the current size of A when they copy their lists into A .

¹² We only need three pointers because the intervals are consecutive.



(a) The red optimal disc D^* contains points of S_1 and S_2 (blue diamonds) from opposite sides of ℓ .

(b) Centering a SKEG disc inside the red interval $D^* \cap \ell$ (marked by two “x” symbols) produces a 2-approximation.

Figure 1: The case where the optimal disc D^* contains points of S from both sides of ℓ .

and the disc computed in the merge step) is a 2-approximation to D^* . For convenience, in the sequel we refer to the disc $D(c, \rho)$ whose centre is on the chord ℓ as a *merge disc*.

DI- Algo proceeds as follows.

1. (Base case) When the recursive step reaches a triangle,¹³ we use the planar 2-approximation algorithm which runs in expected time linear in the number of points of S in the subpolygon under consideration [32, 33].
2. We recur on the subpolygons P_1 and P_2 stored in the left and right child of τ respectively. Note that a recursive call is not necessary if a subpolygon contains fewer than k points of S in it. Let the returned disc with the smaller radius be the current solution.
3. (Merge Step) Consider the diagonal ℓ stored in τ . Compute a merge disc centred on ℓ for the points of $S_1 \cup S_2$.
4. Return the smallest of the three discs.

Lemma 4. *DI- Algo produces a 2-SKEG disc for P .*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the number of vertices r of the polygon.

Base Case In the base case, we have $r = 3$ for a triangle. We get a 2-approximation by running the planar 2-approximation algorithm [33].

Inductive Hypothesis Assume the Lemma holds for polygons with at most t vertices.

Inductive Step Let $|P_\tau| = t + 1$. Partition P_τ into two simple subpolygons P_1 and P_2 by the diagonal stored in τ containing the points $S_1 \subseteq S$ and $S_2 \subseteq S$ respectively. Note that $|P_1|$ and $|P_2|$ are both at most t . By the inductive hypothesis, we have computed a 2-SKEG disc for P_1 and S_1 , and for P_2 and S_2 .

¹³ We could identify convex subpolygons before we get to the triangles, but it would not improve the asymptotic runtime.

Consider the merge disc returned from our merge step. We show in Section 4 that if both $D^* \cap S_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $D^* \cap S_2 \neq \emptyset$ then the merge disc is a 2-approximation. Indeed, if both $D^* \cap S_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $D^* \cap S_2 \neq \emptyset$, then $D^* \cap \ell \neq \emptyset$. In Lemma 5 in Section 4 we prove that at least one point in $D^* \cap \ell$ is considered to be the centre of the merge disc. As such, either the centre of the merge disc is inside $D^* \cap \ell$ (implying a 2-approximation), or the radius of the merge disc is smaller than that of a disc centred on at least one point in $D^* \cap \ell$ (also implying a 2-approximation). If either $D^* \cap S_1 = \emptyset$ or $D^* \cap S_2 = \emptyset$, we have a 2-approximation by the inductive hypothesis and the fact that in this case the optimal disc for $S_1 \cup S_2$ is the same as for whichever set has a non-empty intersection with D^* . Of these three discs, the one with the smallest radius is a 2-approximation for $S_1 \cup S_2$.

□

Theorem 3. *DI-Algo computes a 2-SKEG disc in $O(n \log^2 n \log r + m)$ expected time and $O(n + m)$ expected space.*

Proof. As discussed earlier (at the beginning of Section 3), preprocessing takes $O(n \log r + m)$ time and $O(n + m)$ space.

DI-Algo is a recursive, Divide-and-Conquer algorithm. The recurrence tree of the Divide-and-Conquer algorithm mimics T_B and has $O(\log r)$ depth. The recursive algorithm visits each node of the tree that represents a subpolygon that contains at least k points of S . For nodes representing subpolygons containing fewer than k points of S , there is no work to be done; such a node and the branch of T_B stemming from it are effectively pruned from the recursion tree. By Lemma 4, the result of the merge step is a 2-approximation for P_τ . Therefore, when we finish at the root, we have a 2-approximation to D^* .

The base case of the recursion is triggered when we reach a leaf of T_B . Here P_τ is a triangle. When the base case is reached, DI-Algo runs the planar 2-approximation algorithm in expected time and expected space linear in the number of points of S_τ (i.e., $O(n')$) [32, 33].

We assume for the moment that the merge step runs in expected time $O(n' \log n' \log r + n' \log^2 n')$ and uses $O(n' + r')$ space (we show this in Section 4.1). The expected running time of the base case is dominated by the time for the merge step. This implies that the algorithm runs in $O(n \log n \log^2 r + n \log^2 n \log r + m)$ expected time, including the time for preprocessing. We can simplify this expression to $O(n \log^2 n \log r + m)$. The space bound follows from the space for preprocessing and the space in the merge step which is released after the merge. □

We can balance this expected runtime against the runtime of Theorem 2.

$$\begin{aligned}
n \log^2 n \log r &= \frac{n^2}{k} \log n \log r \\
\Rightarrow n \log n &= \frac{n^2}{k} \\
\Rightarrow k &= \frac{n}{\log n}
\end{aligned}$$

When $k \in O(n/\log n)$, the expected runtime of **DI- Algo** is faster by Theorem 3; when $k \in \omega(n/\log n)$ the runtime of **RS- Algo** is faster by polylogarithmic factors by Theorem 2. Although the runtimes are asymptotically identical when $k \in \Theta(n/\log n)$, **RS- Algo** gets faster as k gets larger. For example, if $k \in \Omega(n)$ **RS- Algo** runs in time $O(n \log n \log r + m)$ and finds a 2-approximation with high probability, whereas Theorem 3 finds a 2-approximation in expected time $O(n \log^2 n \log r + m)$.

This leads to our main theorem and our main algorithm, **Main- Algo**. **Main- Algo** first performs the preprocessing of **Preproc- Algo**. Then, if the polygon is convex, it runs the linear-time planar approximation algorithm [32, 33]. If the polygon is not convex and $k \in \omega(n/\log n)$, it runs **RS- Algo**. Otherwise, it runs **DI- Algo**.

Theorem 4. *If $k \in O(n/\log n)$, **Main- Algo** computes a 2-SKEG disc in expected time $O(n \log^2 n \log r + m)$ and expected space $O(n + m)$, independent of k ; if $k \in \omega(n/\log n)$, **Main- Algo** computes a 2-SKEG disc with high probability in $O((n^2/k) \log n \log r + m)$ deterministic time with $O(n + m)$ space.*

4 Merge

In this section we describe how to perform the merge step of our Divide-and-Conquer algorithm. First we point out that it is not clear whether it is possible to apply the recursive random sampling technique of Chan [18]. His approach requires partitioning the points of S into a constant number of fractional-sized subsets such that the overall solution is the best of the solutions of each of the subsets. It is not clear how to partition the points of S to allow for an efficient merge step. In fact, this is an issue that Chan [18] points out in his paper for a related problem of finding the smallest square containing k points before showing how to circumvent this issue in an orthogonal setting.

Assume a SKEG disc in P_τ for k points of S_τ intersects ℓ and contains at least one point of S_1 and one point of S_2 . In this case our merge step either returns: 1) a KEG disc centred on a special point of ℓ that is guaranteed to be inside a SKEG disc; or 2) a KEG disc centred on ℓ whose radius is smaller than that of such a KEG disc as described in 1).

4.1 Merge Algorithm

For each $u \in S_\tau$, let u_c be the closest point of the chord ℓ to u . Let the set of all such closest points be S_τ^c . We refer to the elements of S_τ^c as *projections* of the elements of S_τ onto ℓ (see Fig. 2). For any $u \in S_\tau$ and radius ρ , let the interval $I(u, \rho) \subseteq \ell$ be $D(u, \rho) \cap \ell$ (i.e., the set




Figure 2: An example of points of S (blue diamonds) and their projections onto ℓ (hollow black diamonds).

of points on ℓ within geodesic distance ρ of u). See Fig. 3. $I(u, \rho)$ is empty if $\rho < d_g(u, u_c)$. For $u_c \in S_\tau^c$ and radius ρ , we say the *depth* of u_c is the number of intervals from points of S_τ that contain u_c using the same distance ρ (i.e., the number of discs of radius ρ centred on points of S_τ that contain u_c).

Observation 1. If the SKEG disc D^* contains at least one point of S_1 and at least one point of S_2 , then $D^* \cap \ell$ is a continuous non-empty interval of ℓ due to geodesic convexity.

Merge-Algo proceeds as follows.

1. Compute $\mathbb{C} = S_\tau^c$.
2. Initialize set $\mathbb{S} = S_\tau$.
3. While $|\mathbb{C}| > 0$:
 - Pick a point $u_c \in \mathbb{C}$ uniformly at random.
 - Find the point $z \in \mathbb{S}$ that is the k^{th} -closest neighbour of u_c .
 - Let $\rho = d_g(u_c, z)$.
 - If $|\mathbb{C}| = 1$, break the while-loop.
 - For each $v \in \mathbb{S}$, compute $I(v, \rho)$. If $I(v, \rho)$ is empty, remove v from \mathbb{S} .
 - For each $w \in \mathbb{C}$, compute the depth of w . If the depth of w is less than k , remove w from \mathbb{C} .




Figure 3: The geodesic discs (arbitrarily red and blue) of radius ρ centred on points of S (blue points) intersect ℓ . The intersection points of red (blue) disc boundaries with ℓ are marked by green (red) triangles. The intervals $I(u, \rho)$ for the points $u \in S$ are the intersections of ℓ with $D(u, \rho)$. Overlapping intervals illustrate points along ℓ where centering a geodesic of radius ρ will contain multiple points of S (i.e., the points of S defining the overlapping intervals).

- Remove u_c from \mathbb{C} .

4. Return u_c and ρ .

Merge- Algo computes the point $u_c^* \in S_\tau^c$ whose distance to its k^{th} -nearest neighbour in S_τ is minimal. In essence, we are given a set Γ of n numbers (i.e., the distances to the k^{th} -nearest neighbours) and want to find the minimum. At each step, the algorithm picks a random element $g \in \Gamma$ and removes all elements in Γ larger than g . When we prove the correctness of **Merge- Algo** we will show that the number of iterations is $O(\log |\Gamma|)$ with high probability.

Lemma 5. *If a SKEG disc D^* contains at least one point of S_τ from each side of ℓ , then for some $u \in S_\tau$ that is in D^* , $D^* \cap \ell$ contains $u_c \in S_\tau^c$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $u \in D^*$ is below ℓ and the centre c^* of D^* is on or above ℓ . Assume that the chord ℓ is horizontal for ease of reference. It was shown by Pollack et al. [50, Corollary 2] that, for any triplet of points p , v , and w in a simple polygon, if the first edge of $\Pi(p, v)$ makes an angle of $\pi/2$ or greater with the first edge of $\Pi(p, w)$, then $d_g(v, w)$ is larger than both $d_g(p, v)$ and $d_g(p, w)$. We use this fact to complete the proof.

Consider $\Pi(c^*, u)$. Since c^* and u are on different sides of ℓ , $\Pi(c^*, u)$ must intersect ℓ at some point z . We want to show that $u_c \in D^*$. If $z = u_c$, then $\Pi(c^*, z) = \Pi(c^*, u_c) \subseteq \Pi(c^*, u)$ and thus $u_c \in D^*$. If $z \neq u_c$, then let us consider the geodesic triangle formed by the union of $\Pi(u_c, z)$, $\Pi(u_c, u)$, and $\Pi(z, u)$. Notice that if u_c is not an endpoint of ℓ then the angle at u_c (i.e., the angle formed by the first edges of $\Pi(u_c, z)$ and $\Pi(u_c, u)$) is $\pi/2$ since $\Pi(u_c, z) \subseteq \ell$; and by the Pythagorean theorem the first edge on $\Pi(u_c, u)$ forms an angle of $\pi/2$ with ℓ (since u_c is the closest point of ℓ to u). This means that $|\Pi(z, u)| > |\Pi(u_c, z)|$ (by Pollack et al. [50, Corollary 2]). Thus, in this case, $u_c \in D^*$ by the triangle inequality: $|\Pi(c^*, u_c)| \leq |\Pi(c^*, z)| + |\Pi(z, u_c)| < |\Pi(c^*, z)| + |\Pi(z, u)| = |\Pi(c^*, u)|$. If $z \neq u_c$ and u_c is an endpoint of ℓ , then the angle at u_c is at least $\pi/2$ and the same argument applies. \square

Lemma 6. *Merge-Algo runs in $O(n' \log n' \log r + n' \log^2 n')$ time with high probability and $O(n' + r')$ space and produces a 2-approximation if $D^* \cap S_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $D^* \cap S_2 \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. If $D^* \cap S_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $D^* \cap S_2 \neq \emptyset$, then we either return a disc centred on a projection of some point of S_τ inside D^* , or a disc centred on a projection whose radius is less than that of such a disc. Thus, the result of the algorithm is a 2-approximation by Lemma 5.

Recall that $|S_\tau| = n'$ and $|P_\tau| = r'$. We assume for the moment that we can compute S_τ^c in $O(n' \log r)$ time and $O(n' + r')$ space (we will show this in Section 4.3). Given the n' elements of S_τ^c or S_τ : we build sets \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{S} in $O(n')$ time and space; we can delete an identified element from the sets in constant time and space; we can iterate through a set in constant time and space per element; and we can pick a point $u_c \in \mathbb{C}$ uniformly at random in $O(1)$ time and space.

Using the shortest-path data structure, we can find the k^{th} -closest neighbour of u_c in $O(n' \log r)$ time and $O(n' + r')$ space by first computing the distance of everyone in \mathbb{S} to u_c in $O(\log r)$ time and $O(r')$ space each (the space is re-used for the next query), and then using a linear-time rank-finding algorithm to find the k^{th} -ranking distance in $O(n')$ time and space [6, 14, 23]. Let ρ be this k^{th} -ranking distance. We assume for the moment that we can compute, for all $O(n')$ elements $v \in \mathbb{S}$, the intervals $I(v, \rho)$ in $O(n' \log r)$ time and $O(n' + r')$ space (we will show this in Section 4.4). Given the intervals, we also assume for the moment that we can compute, for all $O(n')$ elements $w \in \mathbb{C}$, the depth of w in overall $O((|\mathbb{S}| + |\mathbb{C}|) \log(|\mathbb{S}| + |\mathbb{C}|)) = O(n' \log n')$ time and $O(|\mathbb{S}| + |\mathbb{C}|) = O(n')$ space (we will show this in Section 4.4). In $O(n')$ time and space we can remove from \mathbb{S} and \mathbb{C} elements whose interval I is empty or whose depth is less than k , respectively. Elements of \mathbb{S} whose intervals are empty are too far away from ℓ to be contained in the geodesic disc of any element of \mathbb{C} for any radius of value ρ or less, and since ρ is non-increasing in each iteration, we can remove these elements of \mathbb{S} from consideration.¹⁴ Elements of \mathbb{C} whose depth is less than k will contain fewer than k elements of \mathbb{S} in their geodesic discs for any radius of value ρ or less. Since we seek to minimize the value ρ , we can remove these elements of \mathbb{C} from consideration. The removal of these elements ensures ρ is non-increasing in each iteration.

¹⁴ At the moment, removing points from \mathbb{S} is a practical consideration; no lower bound is clear on the number of elements from \mathbb{S} that can be discarded in each iteration, though if one were to find a constant fraction lower bound, one could shave a logarithmic factor off the runtime.

Computing the k^{th} -nearest neighbour of a projection, the intervals I , and the depths of elements of \mathbb{C} dominates the complexity of the while-loop.

We now analyze how many iterations of the while-loop are performed. We associate with each projection in \mathbb{C} the distance associated with its k^{th} -nearest neighbour (and thus the disc’s radius) and assume these distances are unique. Consider a random permutation of these distances. This permutation can be seen as the order in which the elements are inserted into a random binary search tree. Devroye [27] pointed out that the depth (i.e., the level in the binary search tree) of the next item to be inserted is proportional to the sum of: the number of up-records seen so far whose value is less than the item to be inserted (i.e., the number of elements in the ordered sequence so far that were bigger than everything that came before them, but still less than the item to be inserted); and of the number of down-records seen so far whose value is larger than the item to be inserted (i.e., the number of elements in the ordered sequence so far that were smaller than everything that came before them, but still more than the item to be inserted). Every node visited on the path from the root to this item in the constructed tree is one of these records. Devroye [27] then showed that with high probability the depth of the last element is $O(\log n')$ for a sequence of n' items. In our while-loop, we are searching for the element of smallest rank. This can be seen as following the path from the root of this random binary search tree to the smallest element. In each iteration, we pick an element of \mathbb{C} uniformly at random. The radius defined by this element will always be a down-record since it is always k -deep (since it defines the radius), and since the next step in the iteration is to remove elements whose k^{th} -nearest neighbour is farther than the chosen radius. Each time we pick an element at random, it is like encountering a down-record in the random permutation of distances that can be used to create the random binary search tree. The elements that are discarded in an iteration are like the elements in the sequence between two down-records. Thus, with high probability, we require $O(\log n')$ iterations.

The work done in one iteration given sets \mathbb{S} and \mathbb{C} with $|\mathbb{S}| = n'$ and $|\mathbb{C}| \leq n'$ is $O(n' \log r + n' \log n')$ using $O(n' + r')$ space. With high probability we have $O(\log n')$ iterations, thus $O(n' \log n' \log r + n' \log^2 n')$ time with high probability. \square

4.2 With Regards to Shortest Paths

The shortest-path data structure of Guibas and Hershberger [30, 35] represents the shortest path between two points in P as a tree of $O(\log r)$ height whose in-order traversal reveals the edges of the shortest path in order. A query between any source and destination points in P is performed in $O(\log r)$ time and additional space [30, 35]. The data structure stores the distance from a vertex of the shortest-path to the source in the query, so given a vertex of the path the distance to the source can be reported in $O(1)$ time and space.

Funnel Now let us briefly review the notion of a *funnel* [30, 37]. The vertices of the geodesic shortest path between two points a and b , $\Pi(a, b)$, consists of the vertices a , b , and a subset of the vertices of the polygon P forming a polygonal chain [22, 40]. Consider a diagonal ℓ of P , its two endpoints ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 , and a point $p \in \{P \cup S\}$. The union of the three paths $\Pi(p, \ell_1)$, $\Pi(p, \ell_2)$, and ℓ form what is called a funnel. As Guibas

and Hershberger [30] point out, this funnel represents the shortest paths from p to the points on ℓ in that their union is the funnel. Starting at p , the paths $\Pi(p, \ell_1)$ and $\Pi(p, \ell_2)$ may overlap during a subpath, but there is a unique vertex p_a (which is the farthest vertex on their common subpath from p) where the two paths diverge. After they diverge, the two paths never meet again. This vertex p_a is called the *apex*¹⁵ of the funnel. The path from the apex to an endpoint of ℓ forms an *inward-convex* polygonal chain (i.e., a convex path through vertices of P with the bend protruding into the interior of P).

Below we present bounds for operations in a subpolygon. We modify our perspective slightly by re-defining the diagonal to which we refer to make the discussion simpler. Let τ_{up} be the parent of τ in T_B . We change the definition of ℓ to be the diagonal stored in τ_{up} . Note that $\ell \in \partial P_\tau$ (which is a diagonal of P). We consider ℓ to be the x -axis with the downward direction the side of ℓ bordering the exterior of P_τ ; ℓ_1 to be the left endpoint of ℓ ; and ℓ_2 to be the right endpoint of ℓ . Without loss of generality, assume the points of S_τ are *above* ℓ . Recall that $|P_\tau| = r'$ and $|S_\tau| = n'$. A careful reading of Guibas and Hershberger [30, 35] gives us the following.

Observation 2. The returned tree for a shortest-path query for two points in P_τ has $O(r')$ nodes and height $O(\log r')$.

Guibas and Hershberger [30] and Oh and Ahn [47] point out that given the trees representing the shortest paths between a fixed source and two distinct destination points of a chord, the apex of their funnel can be computed in $O(\log r)$ time.

Observation 3. The apex of a funnel from a source point in P_τ to the diagonal ℓ can be computed in $O(\log r)$ time and $O(r')$ space.

Definition 1 (Aronov 1989 [9, Definition 3.1]). For any two points u and v of P , the last vertex (or u if there is none) before v on $\Pi(u, v)$ is referred to as the **anchor** of v (with respect to u).

Definition 2 (Aronov 1989 [9, Definition 3.7]). The *shortest-path tree* of P from a point s of P , $T(P, s)$, is the union of the geodesic shortest paths from s to vertices of P . This type of tree, which is a union of paths in the polygon, should not be confused with the type of tree returned from a query to the shortest path data structure, which is a tree connecting data-structure nodes.

Definition 3 (Aronov 1989 [9, paragraph between 3.8 and 3.9]). Let e be an edge of $T(P, s)$ and let its endpoint furthest from s be v . Let h be the open half-line collinear with e and extending from v in the direction of increasing distance from s . If some initial section of h is contained in the interior of P , we will refer to the maximal such initial section as the *extension segment* of e .

Definition 4 (Aronov 1989 [9, Definition 3.9]). Let the collection of extension segments of edges of $T(P, s)$ be denoted by $E(P, s)$.

¹⁵Sometimes, as in [37], this is called a *cusp*. In [37] the funnel is defined as beginning at the cusp and ending at the diagonal.




Figure 4: Considering the chord ℓ of P to be the x -axis, given a point $u \in S$ we refer to the dashed graph of the function $\text{dist}_u(\cdot)$ as the distance function of u to ℓ . The points f and h on ℓ mark where different pieces of $\text{dist}_u(\cdot)$ begin.

Distance Function of a Point $u \in S_\tau$ Next, let us review the graph we get by plotting the distance from a point u to a line ℓ where the position along ℓ is parameterized by x . Abusing notation, we call the x -monotone curve representing this graph the *distance function*. Without loss of generality, we can assume that the x -axis is the line in question. For a point u , u_x is the x -coordinate of u and u_y is its y -coordinate. This distance function is actually a branch of a *right hyperbola*¹⁶ whose eccentricity is $\sqrt{2}$ and whose focus is therefore at $\sqrt{2} \cdot u_y$. In our polygon P_τ , this distance function measuring the distance from a point $u \in S_\tau$ to a chord ℓ of the polygon becomes a continuous piecewise hyperbolic function. If the funnel from u to the endpoints ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 of ℓ is trivial (i.e., a Euclidean triangle), then the distance function of u to ℓ has one piece expressed as $\text{dist}_u(x) = \sqrt{(x - u_x)^2 + u_y^2}$. We write $\text{dist}_u(\cdot)$ to refer to the function in general. If, on the other hand, there are reflex vertices of P in u 's funnel, the distance function has multiple pieces. The formula for each piece is $\text{dist}_u(x) = \sqrt{(x - w_x)^2 + w_y^2} + d_g(u, w)$, where w is the anchor (i.e., the last vertex of P on $\Pi(u, x)$), and the *domain* of this hyperbolic piece is the set of values of x for which w is the anchor. The domain is defined by the intersection of ℓ with the two extension segments of $E(P_\tau, u)$ that go through w , i.e., without loss of generality, if w is on the path from u to ℓ_1 but is not the apex of the funnel, then we are referring to the extension segment through w and the predecessor of w on $\Pi(u, \ell_1)$, and the extension segment through w and the successor of w on $\Pi(u, \ell_1)$. The domain of the apex is similarly defined, except there will be one extension segment through the apex and its successor in $\Pi(u, \ell_1)$, and one through the apex and its successor in $\Pi(u, \ell_2)$. Given a vertex of the funnel, we can build the hyperbolic piece associated with the vertex in $O(1)$ time and space since the shortest-path query data structure of Guibas and Hershberger [30] stores the distance from the source. Refer to Fig. 4 for an example of a multi-piece distance function.

Consider a point $u \in S_\tau$ and the subset $E \subseteq E(P_\tau, u)$ whose elements form the

¹⁶ Also called a *rectangular* or *equilateral* hyperbola.

domains of the pieces of $\text{dist}_u(\cdot)$ along ℓ . For a given $e \in E$, we refer to $e \cap \ell$ as a **domain marker** (or just **marker**). Sometimes we will need to identify domains that have specific properties so that an appropriate hyperbolic piece of $\text{dist}_u(\cdot)$ can be analyzed. Similar to other papers that find intervals of interest along shortest paths and chords [1, 2, 8, 47], we can use the funnel between u and ℓ to perform a binary search among the domain markers to find a domain of interest. We have the following observation.

Observation 4. For an extension segment $e \in E$, if it takes $O(1)$ time and space to determine which side of $\ell \cap e$ contains a domain of interest along ℓ , then we can find a domain of interest along ℓ and its corresponding hyperbolic piece of $\text{dist}_u(\cdot)$ in $O(\log r)$ time and $O(r')$ space.

4.3 Computing Projections

After briefly re-defining ℓ in Section 4.2, we now re-adjust our perspective by resetting ℓ to be the diagonal stored in τ that splits P_τ .

Before the main while-loop of [Merge-Algo](#) begins, we precompute S_τ^c , i.e., the closest point of ℓ to u for each point $u \in S_\tau$. Recall that $|P_\tau| = r'$ and $|S_\tau| = n'$. As before, let u_c be the closest point of ℓ to u . Equivalently, u_c is the point along ℓ that minimizes $\text{dist}_u(\cdot)$.

Lemma 7. *In $O(n' \log r)$ time and $O(n' + r')$ space we compute the closest point of ℓ to each $u \in S_\tau$.*

Proof. Consider a point $p \in \ell$ and the last edge e of $\Pi(u, p)$ from some $u \in S_\tau$ to p (i.e., the edge to which p is incident). Let the *angle of e* be the smaller of the two angles formed by e and ℓ at p . The range of this angle is $[0, \pi/2]$. We know from Pollack et al. [50, Corollary 2] that $\text{dist}_u(\cdot)$ is minimized when e is perpendicular to ℓ . We also know from Pollack et al. [50, Corollary 2] that given $p' \in \ell$ and an edge e' analogous to e , if the angle of e' is closer to $\pi/2$ than that of e , then $\text{dist}_u(p') < \text{dist}_u(p)$. Lastly, we know from Pollack et al. [50, Lemma 1] that $\text{dist}_u(\cdot)$ is a convex function which means it has a global minimum.

Recall the notions of *domains* of funnel vertices along ℓ and *markers* of extension segments collinear with funnel edges. Given the funnel of u and ℓ , by Observation 3 we can find the apex u_a of the funnel in $O(\log r)$ time and $O(r')$ space. The convex chains $\Pi(u_a, \ell_1)$ and $\Pi(u_a, \ell_2)$ determine the hyperbolic pieces of $\text{dist}_u(\cdot)$. Given u_a , a careful reading of Guibas and Hershberger [30, 35] shows we can compute the representations of $\Pi(u_a, \ell_1)$ and $\Pi(u_a, \ell_2)$ with shortest-path queries in $O(\log r')$ time and $O(r')$ space. By Observation 4 we can use these convex chains to perform a binary search along ℓ to find the domain in which u_c lies (see Fig. 5). This domain has the property that the angle of the last edge on the shortest path from u to the points in this domain is closest to $\pi/2$.

In the binary search, at each marker (as determined by the node currently being visited in the tree representing the convex chain), in $O(1)$ time and space we compute the angle of ℓ with the extension segment defining the marker. Since $\text{dist}_u(\cdot)$ is a convex function, we know that as we slide a point $p \in \ell$ from ℓ_1 to ℓ_2 , the angle of the edge incident to p on $\Pi(u, p)$ will monotonically increase until it reaches $\pi/2$, then monotonically decrease. Thus, after computing the angle of the extension segment with ℓ , we know to which side of its




Figure 5: The funnel from u to the endpoints of ℓ , including the apex u_a and the projection u_c of u onto ℓ . Also seen are the extensions of funnel edges (in blue) and their intersection points with ℓ . These intersection points can be used to perform a binary search along ℓ .

marker to continue our search: the side that contains the smaller angle (because moving in this direction will increase the smaller angle). Thus by Observation 4 the search takes $O(\log r)$ time and $O(r')$ space.

At the end of our search we will have the reflex vertex whose domain contains the edge that achieves the angle closest to $\pi/2$. Then in $O(1)$ time and space we can build the corresponding piece of $\text{dist}_u(\cdot)$ and find the value along ℓ that minimizes it.

The space bounds follow from the n' projections that are computed and the $O(r')$ space used by the shortest-path data structure queries. \square

4.4 Intersecting the Chord with Discs

Let $\partial D(u, \rho)$ be the boundary of the disc $D(u, \rho)$ for a $u \in S_\tau$. Consider the funnel of $u \in S_\tau$ and ℓ and its associated domain markers. Since domain markers are points along ℓ , they provide distances against which to compare. We can use these distances when searching for points on ℓ that are a specified distance away from the point u (which is the point used to define the funnel and hence the markers). For any point $u \in S_\tau$, the distance to ℓ increases

monotonically as we move from its projection u_c to the endpoints of ℓ [50]. Thus if we are given a radius ρ , we can use two funnels to perform two binary searches among these markers between u_c and the endpoints of ℓ (using Observation 4, as with Lemma 7) to find the at most two domains which contain $\partial D(u, \rho) \cap \ell$. If we have a particular radius in mind, it takes constant time and space to test to which side of a domain marker our radius lies (since we know u_c , and that the distance from u to ℓ between u_c and the endpoints of ℓ increases monotonically).

As a subroutine for [Merge-Algo](#), for a given radius ρ , for each u in \mathbb{S} we compute the interval $I(u, \rho) = D(u, \rho) \cap \ell$.

Lemma 8. *In $O(|\mathbb{S}| \log r)$ time and $O(|\mathbb{S}| + r')$ space we compute $I(u, \rho)$ for each u in the given set \mathbb{S} using the given radius ρ .*

Proof. Consider the geodesic disc of radius ρ , $D(u, \rho)$. Since the disc is geodesically convex, if the chord intersects the disc in only one point, it will be at the projection u_c . If it does not intersect the disc, then at u_c the distance from u to ℓ will be larger than ρ . Otherwise, if the chord intersects the disc in two points, u_c splits ℓ up into two intervals, each with one intersection point (i.e., each one contains a point of $\partial D(u, \rho) \cap \ell$). If u_c is an endpoint of ℓ , assuming ℓ has positive length, one of these intervals may degenerate into a point, making u_c coincide with one of the intersection points.

These two intervals to either side of u_c have the property that on one side of the intersection point contained within, the distance from u to ℓ is larger than ρ , and on the other side, the distance is less than ρ . Therefore, if $\partial D(u, \rho)$ does intersect ℓ in two points we can proceed as in the proof of Lemma 7: in $O(\log r)$ time and $O(r')$ space we can build the two funnels of u between u_c and the endpoints of ℓ (truncated at the apices) and then perform a binary search in each to locate the domain in which a point at distance ρ lies. We find the subinterval delimited by the domain markers of the reflex vertices wherein the distance from u to ℓ changes from being more (less) than ρ to being less (more) than ρ . Once we find this domain, we can compute $\partial D(u, \rho) \cap \ell$ in $O(1)$ time and space. \square

Once the intervals $\{I(u, \rho) \mid u \in \mathbb{S}\}$ are computed, we compute the overlay of these intervals as well as with \mathbb{C} and compute the depth of the elements of \mathbb{C} (i.e., how many intervals contain the element in question). See Fig. 6.

Lemma 9. *Given $\{I(u, \rho) \mid u \in \mathbb{S}\} \cup \mathbb{C}$, in $O((|\mathbb{S}| + |\mathbb{C}|) \log(|\mathbb{S}| + |\mathbb{C}|))$ time and $O(|\mathbb{S}| + |\mathbb{C}|)$ space:*

- we compute the overlay $\bigcup_{u \in \mathbb{S}} \{I(u, \rho)\} \cup \mathbb{C}$ of those intervals and \mathbb{C} ;
- we compute the depths of each $w \in \mathbb{C}$.

Proof. We are given $O(|\mathbb{S}|)$ labelled intervals along ℓ , one for each geodesic disc of radius ρ centred on each $u \in \mathbb{S}$. In other words, the set of these intervals is $\{D(u, \rho) \cap \ell : u \in \mathbb{S}\}$. We sort the points of \mathbb{C} and these interval endpoints in $O((|\mathbb{S}| + |\mathbb{C}|) \log(|\mathbb{S}| + |\mathbb{C}|))$ time and $O(|\mathbb{S}| + |\mathbb{C}|)$ space, associating each interval endpoint with the interval it opens or closes as well as the other endpoint for the interval, and the point of \mathbb{S} whose disc created the interval.




Figure 6: The overlay of intervals $\{I(u, \rho) \mid u \in \mathbb{S}\}$ and \mathbb{C} . Intervals (represented with various colours) are delimited by “x” symbols with corresponding endpoints matched by conjoined arrows. The elements of \mathbb{C} are marked by hollow black diamonds.

When we walk along ℓ and enter the interval $D(u, \rho) \cap \ell$ for some $u \in \mathbb{S}$, we say we are in the disc of u . Our last step, done in $O(|\mathbb{S}| + |\mathbb{C}|)$ time and space, is to walk along ℓ and count the number of discs of \mathbb{S} we are concurrently in at any given point. In other words, we count the number of overlapping intervals (i.e., the depths of the subintervals) for points of \mathbb{S} . As we walk along ℓ , when we encounter an element of \mathbb{C} we assign to it the current depth. \square

5 Concluding Remarks

In this paper we have described two methods for computing a 2-SKEG disc using randomized algorithms. With **DI- Algo**, we find a 2-SKEG disc using $O(n + m)$ expected space¹⁷ in $O(n \log^2 n \log r + m)$ expected time; and using **RS- Algo**, in deterministic time that is faster by polylogarithmic factors when $k \in \omega(n/\log n)$, we find a 2-approximation with high probability using worst-case deterministic space $O(n + m)$. We leave as an open problem to solve the 2-SKEG problem in $O(n \log r + m)$ time.

At first glance, one may be surprised that the runtime of **DI- Algo** presented in Theorem 3 is an expression independent of k . One might expect a dependency on k to appear in the runtime of the base case or the merge step when computing an approximation to a SKEG disc. In the base case we avoid a dependence on k by using the (expected)

¹⁷ The space is considered expected because in the base case of the Divide-and-Conquer approach we run the planar approximation algorithm which expects to use space linear in the number of input points. [32, 33]

linear-time 2-approximation algorithm for planar instances [33]. The first few operations in the merge step are projecting the (remaining) candidate points of S onto a chord ℓ , picking a candidate at random, and finding its k^{th} -closest point from the set S . Here we avoid a k in the runtime by computing (in a brute-force style) all the distances from our random candidate to the points of S , and then using a linear-time rank-finding algorithm [6, 14, 23] to find the k^{th} -smallest distance. There is an opportunity here to sensitize the runtime of **DI-Algo** to k (and thus possibly make it more efficient) by finding a clever way to find this k^{th} -closest point. The final part of the merge step is to use the discovered distance as a radius to compute the intersections of geodesic discs centred on points of S with ℓ , then perform a plane sweep over the resulting overlapping intervals to count their depth. However, even if some of the runtimes of these operations are able to be sensitized to k it may not help the overall runtime of the merge step unless a candidate set (our n projections) can be computed in quicker than $O(n \log r)$ time, and unless the filtering of remaining candidates (our intersection of discs with ℓ and counting the resulting depths) can be done in quicker than $O(n \log n)$ time.

5.1 Using k -Nearest Neighbour Queries

In this section, we discuss modifying **RS-Algo** and **DI-Algo** to use the k -nearest neighbour query data structure of de Berg and Staals [26] and compare the runtimes of these modified versions to the original runtimes presented above.

5.1.1 **RS-Algo**:

For **RS-Algo**, rather than explicitly computing the distances from the points in the random sample to the rest of the sites to find the $(k - 1)^{\text{st}}$ -closest neighbour in S , we can use the k -nearest neighbour query data structure of de Berg and Staals [26].

Theorem 5. *Using the k -nearest neighbour query data structure, **RS-Algo** computes a 2-SKEG disc with high probability in $O(n \log n \log^2 r + n \log^3 r + m + (n/k) \log n \log(n+r) \log r)$ expected time using $O(n \log n \log m + m)$ expected space.*

When might Theorem 5 be expected to be more efficient in terms of runtime than Theorem 2? Although **RS-Algo** is used if $k \in \omega(n/\log n)$, we will simplify the analysis by comparing the two runtimes when $k = n/\log n$. In this case, Theorem 2 runs in $O(n \log^2 n \log r + m)$ time, and Theorem 5 runs in expected $O(n \log n \log^2 r + n \log^3 r + m + \log^2 n \log(n+r) \log r)$ time. If $\log n > \log r$, we have that $\log(n+r) \in O(\log n)$ and

$$n \log^2 n \log r > (n \log n \log^2 r + n \log^3 r)$$

Therefore,

$$\log^2 n \log(n+r) \log r \in O(\log^3 n \log r) \in O(n \log^2 n \log r)$$

Thus, when $k = n/\log n$ and $\log n > \log r$, Theorem 5 is expected to be more efficient than Theorem 2. If $\log r > \log n$, then $n \log^3 r > n \log^2 n \log r$, thus Theorem 2 is expected to be more efficient. If $k \in \Theta(n)$, Theorem 2 runs in $O(n \log n \log r + m)$ time, whereas Theorem 5

runs in expected $O(n \log n \log^2 r + n \log^3 r + m + \log n \log(n+r) \log r)$ time. Thus, Theorem 2 is always expected to be more efficient when $k \in \Theta(n)$.

5.1.2 DI-Algo:

Omitted details from this section appear in Appendix E. If we wanted to incorporate the k -nearest neighbour query data structure into [DI-Algo](#), we would use it in the merge step, i.e., in [Merge-Algo](#) to find the k^{th} -nearest neighbour of our randomly chosen projection. When might we get a more efficient algorithm using the k -nearest neighbour query data structure? Perhaps we can get some intuition by noticing that although finding the k^{th} -nearest neighbour of our randomly chosen projection will be faster, the time for the other steps (such as computing intervals along the chord) remains unchanged. We use the same notation as in Section 4.

The first option is to build the data structure over the whole polygon using all points of S , meaning that every query will give the k -nearest neighbours from S , not just the points in the subpolygon under consideration. Since we already get a 2-approximation using only the points of the subpolygon being considered and since S contains this set, we still get a 2-approximation after the recursion if we use the data structure built on all points of S over all of P . Using this approach, the expected space of the algorithm becomes $O(n \log n \log r + m)$ and the expected runtime becomes $O(n \log^2 n \log r + r \log n \log(n+r) \log r + m + rk \log n \log r)$ which is not as efficient as the expected $O(n \log^2 n \log r + m)$ time presented by Theorem 3.

The second option is to build the data structure for each subpolygon of our recursion tree. The expected space usage becomes $O(n \log n \log^2 r + m)$. The expected time to perform [DI-Algo](#) becomes $O(m + n \log^2 n \log r + n \log n \log^3 r + n \log^4 r + r \log n \log(n+r) \log r + rk \log n \log r)$ using this approach, which is not as efficient as the expected time presented by Theorem 3.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Pat Morin, Jean-Lou de Carufel, Michiel Smid, and Sasanka Roy for helpful discussions as well as anonymous reviewers.


References

- [1] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Lars Arge, and Frank Staals. Improved dynamic geodesic nearest neighbor searching in a simple polygon. In *Symposium on Computational Geometry*, volume 99 of *LIPICs*, pages 4:1–4:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018. (Cited on page 22.)
- [2] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Lars Arge, and Frank Staals. Improved dynamic geodesic nearest neighbor searching in a simple polygon. *CoRR*, abs/1803.05765, 2018. (Cited on page 22.)
- [3] Alok Aggarwal, Hiroshi Imai, Naoki Katoh, and Subhash Suri. Finding k points with minimum diameter and related problems. *J. Algorithms*, 12(1):38–56, 1991. (Cited on pages 1, 2, and 6.)
- [4] Hee-Kap Ahn, Luis Barba, Prosenjit Bose, Jean-Lou De Carufel, Matias Korman, and Eunjin Oh. A linear-time algorithm for the geodesic center of a simple polygon. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 56(4):836–859, 2016. (Cited on page 3.)
- [5] Oswin Aichholzer, Thomas Hackl, Matias Korman, Alexander Pilz, and Birgit Vogtenhuber. Geodesic-preserving polygon simplification. *International Journal of Computational Geometry & Applications*, 24(4):307–324, 2014. (Cited on pages 5, 9, and 10.)
- [6] Andrei Alexandrescu. Fast deterministic selection. In *SEA*, volume 75 of *LIPICs*, pages 24:1–24:19. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017. (Cited on pages 10, 18, and 26.)
- [7] Nancy M. Amato, Michael T. Goodrich, and Edgar A. Ramos. Linear-time triangulation of a simple polygon made easier via randomization. In *Symposium on Computational Geometry*, pages 201–212. ACM, 2000. (Cited on pages 5 and 9.)
- [8] Lars Arge and Frank Staals. Dynamic geodesic nearest neighbor searching in a simple polygon. *CoRR*, abs/1707.02961, 2017. (Cited on page 22.)
- [9] Boris Aronov. On the geodesic voronoi diagram of point sites in a simple polygon. *Algorithmica*, 4(1):109–140, 1989. (Cited on pages 2, 6, 20, and 36.)
- [10] Boris Aronov, Steven Fortune, and Gordon T. Wilfong. The furthest-site geodesic voronoi diagram. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 9:217–255, 1993. (Cited on pages 3, 6, and 36.)
- [11] Tetsuo Asano and Godfried Toussaint. Computing the geodesic center of a simple polygon. In *Discrete Algorithms and Complexity*, pages 65–79. Elsevier, 1987. (Cited on page 3.)
- [12] Sang Won Bae, Matias Korman, and Yoshio Okamoto. Computing the geodesic centers of a polygonal domain. *Comput. Geom.*, 77:3–9, 2019. (Cited on page 3.)


-
- [13] Luis Barba. Optimal algorithm for geodesic farthest-point voronoi diagrams. In *SoCG*, volume 129 of *LIPICs*, pages 12:1–12:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019. (Cited on pages 6 and 36.)
- [14] Manuel Blum, Robert W. Floyd, Vaughan R. Pratt, Ronald L. Rivest, and Robert Endre Tarjan. Time bounds for selection. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 7(4):448–461, 1973. (Cited on pages 10, 18, and 26.)
- [15] Magdalene G. Borgelt, Marc J. van Kreveld, and Jun Luo. Geodesic disks and clustering in a simple polygon. *Int. J. Comput. Geometry Appl.*, 21(6):595–608, 2011. (Cited on page 4.)
- [16] Prosenjit Bose, Anthony D’Angelo, and Stephane Durocher. Approximating the smallest k -enclosing geodesic disc in a simple polygon. In *WADS*, volume 14079 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 179–192. Springer, 2023. (Cited on page 1.)
- [17] Prosenjit Bose and Godfried T. Toussaint. Computing the constrained euclidean geodesic and link center of a simple polygon with application. In *Computer Graphics International*, pages 102–110. IEEE Computer Society, 1996. (Cited on page 3.)
- [18] Timothy M. Chan. Geometric applications of a randomized optimization technique. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 22(4):547–567, 1999. (Cited on page 15.)
- [19] Bernard Chazelle. A theorem on polygon cutting with applications. In *FOCS*, pages 339–349. IEEE Computer Society, 1982. (Cited on page 11.)
- [20] Bernard Chazelle. Triangulating a simple polygon in linear time. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 6:485–524, 1991. (Cited on pages 5, 9, 11, and 12.)
- [21] Bernard Chazelle and Leonidas J. Guibas. Visibility and intersection problems in plane geometry. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 4:551–581, 1989. (Cited on page 11.)
- [22] Orin Chein and Leon Steinberg. Routing past unions of disjoint linear barriers. *Networks*, 13(3):389–398, 1983. (Cited on pages 2 and 19.)
- [23] Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms, 3rd Edition*. MIT Press, 2009. (Cited on pages 10, 18, and 26.)
- [24] Anthony D’Angelo. *Constrained Geometric Optimization Problems*. PhD thesis, Carleton University, 2023. DOI [10.22215/etd/2023-15445](https://doi.org/10.22215/etd/2023-15445). (Cited on page 1.)
- [25] Amitava Datta, Hans-Peter Lenhof, Christian Schwarz, and Michiel H. M. Smid. Static and dynamic algorithms for k -point clustering problems. *J. Algorithms*, 19(3):474–503, 1995. (Cited on pages 1 and 2.)
- [26] Sarita de Berg and Frank Staals. Dynamic data structures for k -nearest neighbor queries. *Computational Geometry*, 111:101976, 2023. (Cited on pages 4 and 26.)
- [27] Luc Devroye. Applications of the theory of records in the study of random trees. *Acta Informatica*, 26(1/2):123–130, 1988. (Cited on page 19.)

- [28] Alon Efrat, Micha Sharir, and Alon Ziv. Computing the smallest k -enclosing circle and related problems. *Comput. Geom.*, 4:119–136, 1994. (Cited on pages 1, 2, and 6.)
- [29] David Eppstein and Jeff Erickson. Iterated nearest neighbors and finding minimal polytopes. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 11:321–350, 1994. (Cited on pages 1 and 2.)
- [30] Leonidas J. Guibas and John Hershberger. Optimal shortest path queries in a simple polygon. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 39(2):126–152, 1989. (Cited on pages 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 19, 20, 21, and 22.)
- [31] Leonidas J. Guibas, John Hershberger, Daniel Leven, Micha Sharir, and Robert Endre Tarjan. Linear-time algorithms for visibility and shortest path problems inside triangulated simple polygons. *Algorithmica*, 2:209–233, 1987. (Cited on page 11.)
- [32] Sariel Har-Peled. *Geometric approximation algorithms*, volume 173. American Mathematical Soc., 2011. (Cited on pages 1, 5, 13, 14, 15, 25, 43, 49, and 50.)
- [33] Sariel Har-Peled and Soham Mazumdar. Fast algorithms for computing the smallest k -enclosing circle. *Algorithmica*, 41(3):147–157, 2005. (Cited on pages 1, 2, 5, 13, 14, 15, 25, 26, 43, 49, and 50.)
- [34] Juha Heinonen. *Lectures on analysis on metric spaces*. Springer, New York, 2001. (Cited on page 5.)
- [35] John Hershberger. A new data structure for shortest path queries in a simple polygon. *Information Processing Letters*, 38(5):231–235, 1991. (Cited on pages 3, 5, 9, 10, 19, 20, and 22.)
- [36] David G. Kirkpatrick. Optimal search in planar subdivisions. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 12(1):28–35, 1983. (Cited on pages 11 and 12.)
- [37] Der-Tsai Lee and Franco P. Preparata. Euclidean shortest paths in the presence of rectilinear barriers. *Networks*, 14(3):393–410, 1984. (Cited on pages 2, 19, and 20.)
- [38] Chih-Hung Liu. A nearly optimal algorithm for the geodesic voronoi diagram of points in a simple polygon. *Algorithmica*, 82(4):915–937, 2020. (Cited on page 3.)
- [39] Chih-Hung Liu and D. T. Lee. Higher-order geodesic voronoi diagrams in a polygonal domain with holes. In *SODA*, pages 1633–1645. SIAM, 2013. (Cited on pages 6, 8, and 38.)
- [40] Tomás Lozano-Pérez and Michael A. Wesley. An algorithm for planning collision-free paths among polyhedral obstacles. *Commun. ACM*, 22(10):560–570, 1979. (Cited on page 19.)
- [41] Anna Lubiw and Anurag Murty Naredla. The geodesic edge center of a simple polygon. In *SoCG*, volume 258 of *LIPICs*, pages 49:1–49:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. (Cited on page 4.)

-
- [42] Jiří Matoušek. On enclosing k points by a circle. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 53(4):217–221, 1995. (Cited on pages 1 and 2.)
- [43] Jiří Matoušek. On geometric optimization with few violated constraints. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 14(4):365–384, 1995. (Cited on pages 1 and 2.)
- [44] Nimrod Megiddo. Linear-time algorithms for linear programming in r^3 and related problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 12(4):759–776, 1983. (Cited on page 1.)
- [45] Nimrod Megiddo and Kenneth J. Supowit. On the complexity of some common geometric location problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 13(1):182–196, 1984. (Cited on page 3.)
- [46] Eunjin Oh. Optimal algorithm for geodesic nearest-point voronoi diagrams in simple polygons. In *SODA*, pages 391–409. SIAM, 2019. (Cited on pages 3, 6, and 36.)
- [47] Eunjin Oh and Hee-Kap Ahn. Voronoi diagrams for a moderate-sized point-set in a simple polygon. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 63(2):418–454, 2020. (Cited on pages 6, 7, 8, 20, 22, 37, 38, and 40.)
- [48] Eunjin Oh, Sang Won Bae, and Hee-Kap Ahn. Computing a geodesic two-center of points in a simple polygon. *Comput. Geom.*, 82:45–59, 2019. (Cited on page 3.)
- [49] Eunjin Oh, Jean-Lou De Carufel, and Hee-Kap Ahn. The geodesic 2-center problem in a simple polygon. *Comput. Geom.*, 74:21–37, 2018. (Cited on page 3.)
- [50] Richard Pollack, Micha Sharir, and Günter Rote. Computing the geodesic center of a simple polygon. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 4:611–626, 1989. (Cited on pages 3, 17, 18, 22, and 24.)
- [51] George Rabanca and Ivo Vigan. Covering the boundary of a simple polygon with geodesic unit disks. *CoRR*, abs/1407.0614, 2014. (Cited on page 4.)
- [52] G Toussaint. Computing geodesic properties inside a simple polygon. *Revue D’Intelligence Artificielle*, 3(2):9–42, 1989. (Cited on page 3.)
- [53] Ivo Vigan. Packing and covering a polygon with geodesic disks. *CoRR*, abs/1311.6033, 2013. (Cited on pages 3 and 4.)
- [54] Haitao Wang. On the geodesic centers of polygonal domains. *JoCG*, 9(1):131–190, 2018. (Cited on page 3.)
- [55] Haitao Wang. An optimal deterministic algorithm for geodesic farthest-point voronoi diagrams in simple polygons. In *SoCG*, volume 189 of *LIPICs*, pages 59:1–59:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021. (Cited on pages 3, 5, 6, and 36.)
- [56] Emo Welzl. Smallest enclosing disks (balls and ellipsoids). In *New Results and New Trends in Computer Science*, volume 555 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 359–370. Springer, 1991. (Cited on page 1.)



(a) A disc in \mathbb{R}^2 covered by nine discs of half its radius.



(b) A star-shaped simple polygon with a geodesic disc of radius 1 and some attempts to cover multiple spikes with geodesic discs of radius 0.5.

Figure 7: The larger disc in Fig. 7a can be covered by $O(1)$ discs of half its radius, while in Fig. 7b the geodesic disc of radius 1 requires $\Omega(r)$ geodesic discs of radius 0.5 to cover it.

A A Note on the Doubling Dimension of the Geodesic Metric

Fig. 7a shows a black Euclidean disc of radius 1 being covered by nine red and blue Euclidean discs of radius 0.5. On the other hand, Fig. 7b shows a star-shaped simple polygon with twelve reflex vertices with symmetric spikes equally-angularly-spaced. At its centre is a black point from which we draw the black geodesic disc of radius 1. The tips of the spikes are at distance 2 from the centre and the reflex vertices are at distance 0.5. The pink geodesic disc of radius 0.5 has its pink centre in the left horizontal spike. This disc centre is in the middle (angularly-speaking) of the black disc’s boundary arc contained in that spike. The pink disc does not even contain the two reflex vertices of the spike, so using discs such as this would require at least one disc for each spike. The red geodesic disc of radius 0.5, on the other hand, has its red centre at such a point as to minimize its distance from the black centre while containing the black boundary arc in one of the spikes. Discs such as this also require at least one disc for each spike since it too covers the black disc boundary arc contained in just one spike and it cannot move its centre to cover more of the black disc’s boundary without failing to cover the spike it currently covers. The blue geodesic disc of radius 0.5 is centred on a reflex vertex. It fails to cover the black disc boundary in any spike, showing that discs of this nature also require at least one disc for each spike.

B Figures: Geodesic Bisector Crosses Chord




Figure 8: The bisector of points u and v on opposite sides of the blue chord of the polygon can intersect the chord multiple times. The intersections are labelled with “ \times ”. The different arcs that form the bisector are drawn with different ink styles (e.g., dashed vs dotted vs normal ink).




Figure 9: Zoomed-in view of the first two crossings of Fig. 8.




Figure 10: Zoomed-in view of the third crossing of Fig. 8.

C An Exact Algorithm with Voronoi Diagrams

In this appendix we provide details omitted from Section 1.2.

Lemma 10. *The k points in the SKEG disc define a face of the OKGVD.*

Proof. The SKEG disc centred at a point c^* with radius ρ^* has the properties that only the k points of S in the disc are within distance ρ^* of c^* (by the general position assumption) and this is a disc with the smallest radius that contains k points of S .

We show that the k points in the SKEG disc define a face of the OKGVD by contradiction. Assume that it is not the case. A face in the OKGVD has the property that the k points of S defining the face are the k closest neighbours of S to each point within the face. The point c^* , which is in the polygon, must belong to some face F of the OKGVD since: belonging to an edge or vertex of the OKGVD means there are more than k points in the SKEG disc and thus restricting the disc to the k points in just one of the incident faces will allow for a smaller disc; and because the OKGVD subdivides¹⁸ the polygon. The fact that the points of S defining F are not the same as the set of points in the SKEG disc contradicts that those points are the k closest points of S to c^* . \square

Remark 1. Assuming general positioning, a SKEG disc has either two or three points of S on its boundary.

Lemma 11. *If there are three points on the boundary of the SKEG disc, they define a vertex of the order- $(k - 2)$ geodesic Voronoi diagram. If there are only two points $s, t \in S$ on the boundary of the SKEG disc, then their geodesic bisector $b(s, t)$ defines an edge of the order- $(k - 1)$ geodesic Voronoi diagram and the position along the edge for the centre of the SKEG disc is the midpoint along $\Pi(s, t)$.*

Proof. The SKEG disc centred at a point c^* with radius ρ^* has the properties that only the k points of S in the disc are within distance ρ^* of c^* (by the general position assumption) and this is a disc with the smallest radius that contains k points of S .

We show that the k points in the SKEG disc are associated with a vertex of the order- $(k - 2)$ diagram or an edge of the order- $(k - 1)$ diagram.

By our general position assumption, a Voronoi vertex of the order- $(k - 2)$ Voronoi diagram (that is not the intersection of a Voronoi edge with the boundary of the polygon) has degree three. This means that there are three cells incident to such a vertex, and these three cells have $(k - 3)$ points in common with three points tied for being the $(k - 2)^{\text{nd}}$ -closest at the vertex in question for a total of k points. Since these vertices have the property that the associated k points are the closest k points of S , if c^* coincided with one of these Voronoi vertices and the associated k points were not the k points in the SKEG disc, then we contradict that we had a SKEG disc (or the proper Voronoi diagram).

¹⁸ Otherwise we either contradict that we had a simple polygon, that there are no two sites equidistant to a vertex of the polygon, or that there are at least k points of S in the polygon.

If c^* is not a Voronoi vertex of the order- $(k-2)$ diagram, then it may lie on a Voronoi edge of the order- $(k-1)$ diagram and would thus contain the k points defining the cells that share the edge (or we contradict the set of k points in the SKEG disc). The two points on the disc boundary are the two points $s, t \in S$ whose bisector created the edge. The position for c^* that minimizes the distance to those two points is the midpoint of $\Pi(s, t)$. If this midpoint does not occur on the Voronoi edge, then we contradict that we had a SKEG disc: the disc with only these k points centred at the midpoint has a smaller radius than a disc containing the same points centred anywhere else along $b(s, t)$; if the midpoint occurs in some cell, then the disc centred at the midpoint containing the specified points contains at least one point too many (since the points of this other cell are by definition closer), meaning the disc can be shrunk, contradicting that it was a SKEG disc.

If D^* were to have two points on its boundary and c^* were in a cell (i.e., not on an edge) of the order- $(k-1)$ diagram, then the disc centred there would have to contain the points associated with the cell (otherwise we have a contradiction for what should be contained in a SKEG disc), but it would also have to contain another point to raise the contained total to k . Since this other point is farther than the $(k-1)$ associated with the cell, it will be a point on the boundary of the disc. Since we have a SKEG disc with a minimum radius, the distance to this k^{th} point will be minimized, but that means c^* will be on a bisector between a point of the cell and this farther point from another cell. As pointed out above, the position on the bisector that minimizes the radius of the disc is at the midpoint of the shortest path between the two relevant points. As pointed out above, this means it is along a Voronoi edge, contradicting that c^* lies in the cell.

A similar argument can be made for c^* being a vertex of the order- $(k-2)$ diagram given that D^* has three points on its boundary. \square

When $k = n$, the SKEG disc problem is the same as the problem of computing the geodesic centre of a set of points inside a simple polygon.

The order-1 and the order- $(n-1)$ geodesic Voronoi diagrams have complexity $\Theta(n+r)$ [9, 10]. There is an algorithm for the geodesic nearest-point Voronoi diagram that runs in $O(n \log n + r)$ time and uses $O(n \log n + r)$ space [46], and one for the farthest-point diagram that runs in $O(n \log n + r)$ time and uses $\Theta(n+r)$ space [13, 55].

Lemma 11 tells us we can use the order-1 Voronoi diagram when $k = 2$. Considering the preprocessing time, the construction time, and the time to traverse the diagram performing the appropriate $O(\log r)$ -time queries, we can solve the SKEG disc problem in $O(n \log n + n \log r + r \log r + m)$ time. We say a term in an equation (or the equation) dominates another when the former is greater than the latter multiplied by a constant. We can simplify our expression as follows, assuming the $n \log r$ term dominates the others. This implies the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
& n \log r > m \\
& n \log r > n \log n \\
\Rightarrow & \log r > \log n \\
\Rightarrow & r > n^2 \\
\Rightarrow & m > n^2 \\
\Rightarrow & m^{1/2} > n
\end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $m^{1/2} > \log r$, this brings us to the contradiction that $m > n \log r$. Thus, we can simplify the expression to $O(n \log n + r \log r + m)$.

The farthest-point geodesic Voronoi diagram is the same as the order- $(n-1)$ diagram. When $k = n-1$, it is more efficient to compute a SKEG disc using the farthest-point geodesic Voronoi diagram and, for each face, compute the geodesic centre of the $n-1$ closest points. This gives us the SKEG disc by Lemma 10.

When one uses the OKGVD to compute a SKEG disc, the approach is to compute the geodesic centres of the k points defining each face, and then choose the SKEG disc. Oh and Ahn [47, Lemma 3.9] presented a method to find the geodesic centre of k points in $O(k \log k \log^2 r)$ time and $O(k+r)$ space. The other method for computing the appropriate geodesic centres is to first compute CH_g for the k points defining each face, and then compute the geodesic centre of the weakly simple polygon formed by the CH_g .

The time for the Oh and Ahn approach (i.e., $O(k \log k \log^2 r)$) always dominates the time to compute CH_g (i.e., $O(k \log r + k \log k)$). Thus, the Oh and Ahn approach is only more efficient for computing the geodesic centres of the requisite points when its runtime is dominated by the time to compute the geodesic centre of CH_g . As has already been mentioned, the time to compute the geodesic centre of a weakly simple polygon is linear in its size. The size of CH_g of the k points of S defining a face of the OKGVD is $O(r+k)$. Thus, the Oh and Ahn approach is more efficient when $k \log k \log^2 r \in O(r)$.

When $k \log k \log^2 r \in O(r)$, it is more efficient to use the approach of Oh and Ahn [47, Lemma 3.9] to find the geodesic centre of k points in $O(k \log k \log^2 r)$ time and $O(k+r)$ space for each face of the OKGVD, yielding $O((r+n) \cdot k \log k \log^2 r)$ time over all faces and $O(r+n)$ space. Substituting $k = n-1$, noting that $k \log k \log^2 r \in O(r)$ means $n \in O(r)$, and considering the preprocessing, the time we use is

$$\begin{aligned}
& O((r+n) \cdot n \log n \log^2 r + m) \\
& = O(nr \log n \log^2 r + m)
\end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, it is more efficient to compute CH_g of the k points of S associated with each face of the diagram to obtain weakly simple polygons, and then compute the geodesic centres of those geodesic convex hulls. Observe that the complexity of CH_g of k -point

subsets of S is $O(r + k)$. We spend $O(r + n) \cdot O(k \log r + k \log k)$ time to compute CH_g of each subset of k points that defines a face; then we compute the geodesic centres in $O(r + n) \cdot O(r + k)$ time and $O(r + n)$ space. Substituting $k = n - 1$ and considering the preprocessing cost, the time used becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & O((r + n) \cdot (n \log r + n \log n + r) + m) \\ &= O(n^2 \log n + n^2 \log r + nr \log n + nr \log r + r^2 + m) \end{aligned}$$

Oh and Ahn [47] showed that the complexity of the OKGVD of n points in a simple r -gon is $\Theta(k(n - k) + \min(kr, r(n - k)))$. The fastest algorithms to compute the OKGVD are the one by Oh and Ahn [47] that runs in time $O(k^2 n \log n \log^2 r + \min(kr, r(n - k)))$, and the one by Liu and Lee [39] that runs in $O(k^2 n \log n + k^2 r \log r)$ time. They both use $\Omega(k(n - k) + \min(kr, r(n - k)))$ space (which is $\Omega(n + r)$ for constant k or k close to n and $\Omega(kn + kr) = \Omega(n^2 + nr)$ for k a constant fraction of n).

We now show that the approach of Oh and Ahn [47] is more efficient when $n \log n \log r \in O(r)$, which means the approach of Liu and Lee [39] is more efficient the rest of the time.

Consider the largest-order terms in the running time of the Oh and Ahn approach:

$$\underbrace{k^2 n \log n \log^2 r}_A + \underbrace{\min(kr, r(n - k))}_B \tag{1}$$

Similarly, let us consider the largest-order terms in the running time of the approach of Liu and Lee:

$$\underbrace{k^2 n \log n}_C + \underbrace{k^2 r \log r}_D \tag{2}$$

When is Eq. (1) dominated by Eq. (2)?

Term C is always dominated by term A, so if Eq. (2) dominates Eq. (1) it will be when term D dominates terms A and B.

When the minimum in term B is kr , it is dominated by term D. When the minimum in term B is $r(n - k)$, it will be $O(nr)$. But this happens when $k \in O(n)$ (e.g., $k = n/2$), in which case term D becomes $O(n^2 r \log r)$ and dominates term B.

Thus we have that Eq. (1) is dominated by Eq. (2) when:

$$\begin{aligned} & k^2 n \log n \log^2 r \in O(k^2 r \log r) \\ \Rightarrow & n \log n \log r \in O(r) \end{aligned}$$

The complexity of the OKGVD is $\Theta(k(n - k) + \min(kr, r(n - k)))$. For $1 < k < n - 1$, by Lemma 11 it suffices to compute the order- $(k - 2)$ and order- $(k - 1)$ geodesic Voronoi

diagrams and consider: the vertices of the order- $(k - 2)$ diagram; and the midpoints of the shortest paths between the points defining edges shared by adjacent cells of the order- $(k - 1)$ diagram. We compute the diagrams in $O(k^2 n \log n \log^2 r + \min(kr, r(n - k)))$ time for $n \log n \log r \in O(r)$ and $O(k^2 n \log n + k^2 r \log r)$ time otherwise. Using shortest-path queries we traverse the diagrams in $O(k(n - k) + \min(kr, r(n - k))) \cdot O(\log r)$ time while comparing the candidates from the edges and vertices. Thus, for $n \log n \log r \in O(r)$, the time used including preprocessing is

$$\begin{aligned} & O(k^2 n \log n \log^2 r + \min(kr, r(n - k))) \\ & \quad + \log r \cdot (k(n - k) + \min(kr, r(n - k))) + m \\ & = O(k^2 n \log n \log^2 r + \min(kr, r(n - k)) \log r + m) \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

When $k \in O(1)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & O(n \log n \log^2 r + r \log r + m) \\ \Rightarrow & = O(r \log r + m) \end{aligned}$$

When $k \in \Theta(n)$, we have:

$$O(n^3 \log n \log^2 r + nr \log r + m)$$

The time for the Liu and Lee approach, including preprocessing, is

$$\begin{aligned} & O(k^2 n \log n + k^2 r \log r + \log r \cdot (k(n - k) + \min(kr, r(n - k)))) + m \\ & = O(k^2 n \log n + k^2 r \log r + k(n - k) \log r + \min(kr, r(n - k)) \log r + m) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

When $k \in O(1)$, we get:

$$O(n \log n + n \log r + r \log r + m)$$

When $k \in \Theta(n)$, we have:

$$O(n^3 \log n + n^2 r \log r + m)$$

Compare these runtimes to those we get by using the k^{th} -order geodesic Voronoi diagram. When $n \log n \log r \in O(r)$, the more efficient construction time is $O(k^2 n \log n \log^2 r + \min(kr, r(n - k)))$. When $k \log k \log^2 r \in O(r)$, the more efficient method for the geodesic

centre of k points is the method by Oh and Ahn [47] which runs in $O(k \log k \log^2 r)$ time, which we run on each of the $\Theta(k(n - k) + \min(kr, r(n - k)))$ faces. This gives us the following, which we can compare to Eq. (3):

$$\begin{aligned}
 & O(k^2 n \log n \log^2 r + \min(kr, r(n - k))) \\
 & \quad + k \log k \log^2 r \cdot (k(n - k) + \min(kr, r(n - k))) + m) \\
 = & O(k^2 n \log n \log^2 r + \min(kr, r(n - k)) + k \log k \log^2 r \cdot \min(kr, r(n - k)) + m) \quad (5)
 \end{aligned}$$

When $k \in O(1)$, we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & O(n \log n \log^2 r + r \log^2 r + m) \\
 \Rightarrow & = O(r \log r + r \log^2 r + m) \\
 \Rightarrow & = O(r \log^2 r + m)
 \end{aligned}$$

When $k \in \Theta(n)$, we have the following.

$$O(n^3 \log n \log^2 r + n^2 r \log n \log^2 r + m)$$

When $k \log k \log^2 r \notin O(r)$, the more efficient method of finding the geodesic centre of the k points defining a face is to compute CH_g of those points and then use the linear-time algorithm for the geodesic centre of simple polygons. Thus, for each of the $\Theta(k(n - k) + \min(kr, r(n - k)))$ faces, we compute the CH_g in $O(k \log k + k \log r)$ time, then spend $O(r + k)$ time to find the geodesic centre. We can compare the following to Eq. (3).

$$\begin{aligned}
 & O(k^2 n \log n \log^2 r + \min(kr, r(n - k))) \\
 & \quad + (k \log k + k \log r + r) \cdot (k(n - k) + \min(kr, r(n - k))) + m) \\
 = & O(k^2 n \log n \log^2 r + kr(n - k) + r \cdot \min(kr, r(n - k))) \\
 & \quad + (k \log k + k \log r) \cdot \min(kr, r(n - k)) + m) \quad (6)
 \end{aligned}$$

The case for $k \in O(1)$ is invalid. If $k \log k \log^2 r \notin O(r)$, that implies $r \in O(k \log k \log^2 r)$, but because $k \in O(1)$, that implies $r \in O(\log^2 r)$, which is false.

When $k \in \Theta(n)$, we get:

$$O(n^3 \log n \log^2 r + n^2 r \log n + n^2 r \log r + nr^2 + m)$$

When $n \log n \log r \notin O(r)$, the more efficient OKGVD construction time is $O(k^2 n \log n + k^2 r \log r)$. When $k \log k \log^2 r \in O(r)$, we have the following to compare against Eq. (4):

$$\begin{aligned}
 & O(k^2 n \log n + k^2 r \log r + k \log k \log^2 r \cdot (k(n - k) + \min(kr, r(n - k))) + m) \\
 = & O(k^2 n \log n + k^2 r \log r + k^2(n - k) \log k \log^2 r \\
 & + k \log k \log^2 r \cdot \min(kr, r(n - k)) + m)
 \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

When $k \in O(1)$, we get:

$$O(n \log n + n \log^2 r + r \log^2 r + m)$$

The case for $k \in \Theta(n)$ is invalid. In this case, we have $r \in O(n \log n \log r)$ and $k \log k \log^2 r \in O(r)$ which, when $k \in \Theta(n)$, implies $n \log n \log^2 r \in O(n \log n \log r)$.

When $k \log k \log^2 r \notin O(r)$, we can compare Eq. (4) to:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & O(k^2 n \log n + k^2 r \log r + (k \log k + k \log r + r) \cdot (k(n - k) + \min(kr, r(n - k))) + m) \\
 = & O(k^2 n \log n + k^2 r \log r + k^2(n - k) \cdot (\log k + \log r) + kr(n - k) \\
 & + (k \log k + k \log r) \cdot \min(kr, r(n - k)) + r \cdot \min(kr, r(n - k)) + m)
 \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Similar to before, the case for $k \in O(1)$ is invalid; we would have the implications that $r \in O(k \log k \log^2 r)$ and thus $r \in O(\log^2 r)$, which is false.

When $k \in \Theta(n)$, we get:

$$O(n^3 \log n + n^3 \log r + n^2 r \log n + n^2 r \log r + nr^2 + m)$$

Thus, we see that for $1 < k < n - 1$ it is more efficient to use the order- $(k - 2)$ and order- $(k - 1)$ geodesic Voronoi diagrams.

Theorem 1. *Given an integer $1 < k \leq n$, a SKEG disc of the points of S can be computed in:*

| k | <i>Time</i> | <i>Space</i> |
|---------|---|---|
| n | $O(n \log n + m)$ | $\Theta(n + m)$ |
| $n - 1$ | if $k \log k \log^2 r \in O(r)$ • $O(nr \log n \log^2 r + m)$ else • $O(n^2 \log n + n^2 \log r + nr \log n + nr \log r + r^2 + m)$ | $\Theta(n + m)$ |
| 2 | $O(n \log n + r \log r + m)$ | $O(n \log n + m)$ |
| else | if $n \log n \log r \in O(r)$ • $O(k^2 n \log n \log^2 r + \min(rk, r(n - k)) \log r + m)$ else • $O(k^2 n \log n + k^2 r \log r + k(n - k) \log r + \min(kr, r(n - k)) \log r + m)$ | $\Omega(k(n - k))$ $+ \min(rk, r(n - k))$ $+ m$ |

Ignoring polylogarithmic factors, the worst-case runtime for $k = \{2, n\}$ is $O(n + m)$; for $k = n - 1$: if $k \log k \log^2 r \in O(r)$ is $O(nr + m)$, else, is $O(n^2 + nr + r^2 + m)$; for $k < n - 1$: if $n \log n \log r \in O(r)$ is $O(k^2n + \min(rk, r(n - k)) + m)$, and $O(k^2n + k^2r + \min(kr, r(n - k)) + m)$ otherwise.

D DI-Algo Details

In this section we provide details omitted from Section 3.

Theorem 3. *DI-Algo* computes a 2-SKEG disc in $O(n \log^2 n \log r + m)$ expected time and $O(n + m)$ expected space.

Proof. As discussed earlier (at the beginning of Section 3), preprocessing takes $O(n \log r + m)$ time and $O(n + m)$ space.

DI-Algo is a recursive, Divide-and-Conquer algorithm. The recurrence tree of the Divide-and-Conquer algorithm mimics T_B and has $O(\log r)$ depth. The recursive algorithm visits each node of the tree that represents a subpolygon that contains at least k points of S . For nodes representing subpolygons containing fewer than k points of S , there is no work to be done; such a node and the branch of T_B stemming from it are effectively pruned from the recursion tree. By Lemma 4, the result of the merge step is a 2-approximation for P_τ . Therefore, when we finish at the root, we have a 2-approximation to D^* .

The base case of the recursion is triggered when we reach a leaf of T_B . Here P_τ is a triangle. When the base case is reached, DI-Algo runs the planar 2-approximation algorithm in expected time and expected space linear in the number of points of S_τ (i.e., $O(n')$) [32, 33].

We assume for the moment that the merge step runs in expected time $O(n' \log n' \log r + n' \log^2 n')$ and uses $O(n' + r')$ space (we show this in Section 4.1). The expected running time of the base case is dominated by the time for the merge step. As we show below, this implies that the algorithm runs in $O(n \log n \log^2 r + n \log^2 n \log r + m)$ expected time.

Let σ be the number of nodes in T_B at the current level of the tree (i.e., the number of nodes whose depth in the tree is the same as that of τ). For $1 \leq j \leq \sigma$, denote the nodes of this level by τ_j , and denote by n_j the number of points of S in the polygon associated with τ_j . For $1 \leq j \leq \sigma$, for each τ_j we perform an iteration of the Divide-and-Conquer algorithm (i.e., the merge step) in expected time $O(n_j \log n_j \log r + n_j \log^2 n_j)$. The runtime depends on n_j , which may change from node to node. However, across a given level of the decomposition tree, the sum of the different values of n_j is n . Let X_j be the random variable denoting the runtime of the merge step and all non-recursive operations for the j^{th} node. Now let W count the work done in this level of the decomposition tree. We have the following calculation for the time and expected time spent on each level of the decomposition tree:

$$\begin{aligned}
 W &= O(\Sigma_{j=1}^{\sigma} X_j) \\
 E[W] &= O(E[\Sigma_{j=1}^{\sigma} X_j]) \\
 &= O(\Sigma_{j=1}^{\sigma} E[X_j]) \\
 &= O(\Sigma_{j=1}^{\sigma} (n_j \log r \log n_j + n_j \log^2 n_j)) \quad (\text{by Lemma 6}) \\
 &= O(\log r \Sigma_{j=1}^{\sigma} n_j \log n + \Sigma_{j=1}^{\sigma} n_j \log^2 n) \\
 &= O(\log n \log r (\Sigma_{j=1}^{\sigma} n_j) + \log^2 n (\Sigma_{j=1}^{\sigma} n_j)) \\
 &= O(n \log n \log r + n \log^2 n)
 \end{aligned}$$

The space bound follows from the space for preprocessing and the space in the merge step which is released after the merge. Since the expected time spent at each level is $O(n \log n \log r + n \log^2 n)$ and there are $O(\log r)$ levels, the expected time bound of the whole algorithm is $O(n \log n \log^2 r + n \log^2 n \log r)$ plus $O(r)$ time to traverse T_B .

We arrive at $O(n \log n \log^2 r + n \log^2 n \log r + m)$ expected time, including the time for preprocessing. We can simplify this expression. Consider the largest-order terms in the running time:

$$\underbrace{n \log n \log^2 r}_A + \underbrace{n \log^2 n \log r}_B + \underbrace{m}_C \tag{9}$$

Assume A dominates B and C, by which we mean A is greater than a constant multiplied by either term. This implies Properties (10) and (11):

$$n \log n \log^2 r > m \tag{10}$$

$$n \log n \log^2 r > 3 \cdot (n \log^2 n \log r) \tag{11}$$

$$\log r > 3 \cdot (\log n) \quad \text{by (11)} \tag{12}$$

$$\Rightarrow r > n^3$$

$$\Rightarrow m > n^3$$

$$\Rightarrow m^{1/2} > n^{3/2}$$

$$\Rightarrow m^{1/2} > n \log n \tag{13}$$

$$m^{1/2} > \log^2 m$$

$$\Rightarrow m^{1/2} > \log^2 r \tag{14}$$

$$m > n \log n \log^2 r \quad \text{by (13) and (14)} \tag{15}$$

Property (15) contradicts Property (10), and our assumption must be false. Consequently, we can simplify Expression (9) as follows:

$$n \log^2 n \log r + m \tag{16}$$

□

E Using k -Nearest Neighbour Queries

DI-Algo:

If we wanted to incorporate the k -nearest neighbour query data structure into [DI-Algo](#), we would use it in the merge step, i.e., in [Merge-Algo](#) to find the k^{th} -nearest neighbour of our randomly chosen projection. When might we get a more efficient algorithm using the k -nearest neighbour query data structure? Perhaps we can get some intuition by noticing that although finding the k^{th} -nearest neighbour of our randomly chosen projection will be faster, the time for the other steps (such as computing intervals along the chord) remains unchanged. We use the same notation as in [Section 4](#).

The first option is to build the data structure over the whole polygon using all points of S , meaning that every query will give the k -nearest neighbours from S , not just the points in the subpolygon under consideration. Since we already get a 2-approximation using only the points of the subpolygon being considered and since S contains this set, we still get a 2-approximation after the recursion if we use the data structure built on all points of S over all of P . Using this approach, the expected space of the algorithm becomes $O(n \log n \log r + m)$ and the expected runtime becomes $O(n \log^2 n \log r + r \log n \log(n + r) \log r + m + rk \log n \log r)$. Indeed, we have the same $O(m + n \log^2 n \log r)$ as before, but now each node of our decomposition tree will be making this k -nearest neighbour query $O(\log n')$ times with high probability when not in the base case. More specifically, in one iteration of the merge step we spend expected $O(n' \log n' \log r + n' \log^2 n' + \log n' \log(n + r) \log r + k \log n' \log r)$ time. We can proceed as in the proof of [Theorem 3](#) in [Appendix D](#).

Let σ be the number of nodes in T_B at the current level of the tree (i.e., the number of nodes whose depth in the tree is the same as that of τ). For $1 \leq j \leq \sigma$, denote the nodes of this level by τ_j , and denote by n_j the number of points of S in the polygon associated with τ_j . For $1 \leq j \leq \sigma$, for each τ_j we perform an iteration of the Divide-and-Conquer algorithm (i.e., the merge step) in expected time $O(n_j \log n_j \log r + n_j \log^2 n_j + \log n_j \log(n + r) \log r + k \log n_j \log r)$. The runtime depends on n_j which may change from node to node. However, across a given level of the decomposition tree, the sum of the different values of n_j is n . Let X_j be the random variable denoting the runtime of the merge step and all non-recursive operations for the j^{th} node. Now let W count the work done in this level of the decomposition tree. Since the first two summands are the same as in the proof of [Theorem 3](#), we omit them and focus on the latter two. We have the following calculation for the time and expected time spent on each level of the decomposition tree:

$$\begin{aligned}
W &= O(\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} X_j) \\
E[W] &= O(E[\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} X_j]) \\
&= O(\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} E[X_j]) \\
&= O(\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} (\log n_j \log(n+r) \log r + k \log n_j \log r)) \\
&= O(\log(n+r) \log r (\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} \log n_j) + k \log r (\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} \log n_j)) \\
&= O(\log(n+r) \log r (\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} \log n) + k \log r (\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} \log n)) \\
&= O(\log n \log(n+r) \log r (\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} 1) + k \log n \log r (\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} 1)) \\
&= O(r \log n \log(n+r) \log r + rk \log n \log r) \\
&\quad (\text{since there are at most } r \text{ nodes in a level})
\end{aligned}$$

However, since there are only $O(r)$ nodes in the entire tree, this implies that we expect to spend $O(r \log n \log(n+r) \log r + rk \log n \log r)$ time overall for k -nearest neighbour queries, thus we expect to spend $O(n \log^2 n \log r + m + r \log n \log(n+r) \log r + rk \log n \log r)$ time, which is not as efficient as the expected $O(n \log^2 n \log r + m)$ time presented by Theorem 3.

The second option is to build the data structure for each subpolygon of our recursion tree. We use familiar r_j notation to denote the number of subpolygon vertices in the j^{th} node of a level of T_B .

$$\begin{aligned}
E[\text{space for a level of } T_B] &= O(E[\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} \text{space for the } j^{\text{th}} \text{ node}]) \\
&= O(\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} E[\text{space for the } j^{\text{th}} \text{ node}]) \\
&= O(\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} (n_j \log n_j \log r_j)) \\
&= O(\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} (n_j \log n \log r)) \\
&= O(\log n \log r \sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} (n_j)) \\
&= O(n \log n \log r)
\end{aligned}$$

Given that there are $O(\log r)$ levels of T_B and considering the other space used in preprocessing, the expected space usage becomes $O(n \log n \log^2 r + m)$. The expected time to build the k -nearest neighbour query data structures for each level of T_B is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
E[\text{construction time for a level of } T_B] &= O(E[\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} \text{time for the } j^{\text{th}} \text{ node}]) \\
&= O(\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} E[\text{time for the } j^{\text{th}} \text{ node}]) \\
&= O(\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} n_j (\log n_j \log^2 r + \log^3 r)) \\
&= O((\log n \log^2 r + \log^3 r) \sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} (n_j)) \\
&= O(n (\log n \log^2 r + \log^3 r))
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we expect construction over the whole tree to take $O(n \log n \log^3 r + n \log^4 r)$ time. Similar to before, the expected time spent performing queries to the data structure is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
E[\text{query time for a level of } T_B] &= O(E[\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} \text{query time for the } j^{\text{th}} \text{ node}]) \\
&= O(\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} E[\text{query time for the } j^{\text{th}} \text{ node}]) \\
&= O(\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} (\log n_j \log(n_j + r) \log r + k \log n_j \log r)) \\
&= O(\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} \log n_j \log(n_j + r) \log r + \sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} k \log n_j \log r) \\
&= O(\sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} \log n \log(n + r) \log r + \sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} k \log n \log r) \\
&= O(\log n \log(n + r) \log r \sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} (1) + k \log n \log r \sum_{j=1}^{\sigma} (1)) \\
&= O(r \log n \log(n + r) \log r + rk \log n \log r)
\end{aligned}$$

As before, the $O(r)$ nodes in the tree imply $O(r \log n \log(n+r) \log r + rk \log n \log r)$ expected time spent performing queries across all nodes of the tree.

Thus the expected time to perform [DI- Algo](#) becomes $O(m+n \log^2 n \log r + n \log n \log^3 r + n \log^4 r + r \log n \log(n+r) \log r + rk \log n \log r)$ using this approach, which is not as efficient as the expected time presented by [Theorem 3](#).

F Pseudocode

RS-*Algo* is discussed in Section 2.

| Algorithm RS-<i>Algo</i>: | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| input : | simple polygon P_{in} , set S of points in P_{in} with $ S = n$, $k \leq S $ |
| output: | A point $c \in S$ and a value ρ such that $D(c, \rho)$ is a SKEG disc for points of S that is <i>centred on a point of S</i> |
| | */ |
| /* Start preprocessing | |
| 1 | $P = \text{simplifyPolygon}(P_{in});$ |
| 2 | Build a shortest-path data structure on P ; |
| | */ |
| /* End preprocessing | |
| 3 | $\text{minPoint} = \text{some point in } S;$ |
| 4 | $\text{minRadius} = \text{infinity};$ |
| 5 | for $i = 0, i < (n/k) \ln(n), ++ i$ do |
| 6 | Pick a point $c \in S$ uniformly at random; |
| 7 | $\text{temp} = \text{geodesic distance from } c \text{ to its } (k-1)^{\text{st}}\text{-closest point in } S \setminus \{c\};$ |
| 8 | if $\text{temp} < \text{minRadius}$ then |
| 9 | $\text{minRadius} = \text{temp};$ |
| 10 | $\text{minPoint} = c;$ |
| 11 | end |
| 12 | end |
| 13 | return $\text{minPoint}, \text{minRadius}$ |

Preproc-*Algo* is discussed in Section 3.

| Algorithm Preproc-<i>Algo</i>: | |
|---|---|
| input : | simple polygon P_{in} , set of points S in P_{in} with $ S = n$, $k \leq S $ |
| output: | everything computed below |
| $P = \text{simplifyPolygon}(P_{in});$ | |
| Build a shortest-path data structure on P ; | |
| $T_B = \text{a balanced hierarchical polygon decomposition of } P;$ | |
| Build an $O(\log r)$ query-time point-location data structure on P using the triangulation underlying T_B ; | |
| Compute which points of S lie in each subpolygon represented by T_B ; | |

DI-Algo is presented in Section 3.1.

Algorithm DI-Algo:

```

input : current node  $\tau$  in the balanced decomposition tree  $T_B$  containing
         diagonal  $\ell$ , simple polygon  $P_\tau$  split by  $\ell$ , set of points  $S_\tau$  in  $P_\tau$  with
          $|S| = n$ ,  $k \leq |S|$ 
output: a point  $c$  in  $P_\tau$  and a value  $\rho$  such that  $D(c, \rho)$  is a 2-SKEG disc for
         the points of  $S_\tau$ 

/* Preprocessing done in Preproc-Algo before the first recursive
   call                                                                    */
if  $P_\tau$  is a triangle then
  | (minPoint, minRadius) = output of the planar approximation algorithm for
  | the points of  $S_\tau$  in the Euclidean plane [32, 33];
end
else
  | Choose a side of  $\ell$  to be left;
  |  $P_1$  = subpolygon of  $P_\tau$  left of  $\ell$ ;
  |  $P_2$  = subpolygon of  $P_\tau$  right of  $\ell$ ;
  |  $S_1$  = points of  $S_\tau$  in  $P_1$ ;
  |  $S_2$  = points of  $S_\tau$  in  $P_2$ ;
  | (leftPoint, leftRadius) = DI-Algo(left child of  $\tau$  in  $T_B$ ,  $P_1$ ,  $S_1$ ,  $k$ );
  | (rightPoint, rightRadius) = DI-Algo(right child of  $\tau$  in  $T_B$ ,  $P_2$ ,  $S_2$ ,  $k$ );
  | if  $leftRadius < rightRadius$  then
  | | minRadius = leftRadius;
  | | minPoint = leftPoint;
  | end
  | else
  | | minRadius = rightRadius;
  | | minPoint = rightPoint;
  | end
  | /* Begin merge step                                                                    */
  | (tempPoint, tempRadius) = Compute a merge disc centred on  $\ell$  for the
  | points of  $S_1 \cup S_2$ ;
  | if  $tempRadius < minRadius$  then
  | | minRadius = tempRadius;
  | | minPoint = tempPoint;
  | end
  | /* End merge step                                                                    */
end
return  $minPoint$ ,  $minRadius$ 

```

Main-[Algo](#) is presented at the end of Section 3.

Algorithm Main-[Algo](#):

```

input : simple polygon  $P_{in}$ , set of points  $S$  in  $P_{in}$  whose cardinality is  $n$ ,
          $k \leq |S|$ 
output: a point  $c$  in  $P_{in}$  and a value  $\rho$  such that  $D(c, \rho)$  is a 2-SKEG disc for
         the points of  $S$ 

/* Start preprocessing                                     */
Run Preproc-Algo and get polygon  $P$ ;
/* End preprocessing                                     */
if  $P$  is convex then
    | (minPoint, minRadius) = output of the planar approximation algorithm
    | [32, 33];
end
else if  $k \in \omega(n/\log n)$  then
    | (minPoint, minRadius) = RS-Algo( $P, S, k$ );
end
else
    | (minPoint, minRadius) = DI-Algo(root of  $T_B, P, S, k$ );
end
return minPoint, minRadius

```

Merge-Algo is presented in Section 4.

Algorithm Merge-Algo:

input : current diagonal ℓ from the node τ in T_B splitting polygon P_τ into P_1 and P_2 with $|P_\tau| = r'$, set of points $S_\tau = S_1 \cup S_2$ in P_τ with $|S_\tau| = n'$, $k \leq |S_\tau|$
output: a point $c \in \ell$ and a value ρ such that $D(c, \rho)$ is a 2-SKEG disc for the points of S_τ in P_τ if D^* contains at least one point of S_1 and at least one point of S_2

Compute S_τ^c ;

Initiate candidate set $\mathbb{C} = S_\tau^c$;

Initiate set $\mathbb{S} = S_\tau$;

while $|\mathbb{C}| > 0$ **do**

 Pick a point $u_c \in \mathbb{C}$ uniformly at random;

 Find the point $z \in \mathbb{S}$ that is the k^{th} -closest neighbour of u_c ;

 Let $\rho = d_g(u_c, z)$;

if $|\mathbb{C}| == 1$ **then**

 | break;

end

foreach $v \in \mathbb{S}$ **do**

 | Compute $I(v, \rho)$;

if $I(v, \rho)$ is empty **then**

 | Remove v from \mathbb{S} ;

end

end

foreach $w \in \mathbb{C}$ **do**

 | Compute the depth of w ;

if the depth of w is less than k **then**

 | Remove w from \mathbb{C} ;

end

end

 Remove u_c from \mathbb{C} ;

end

return u_c, ρ