

Point Line Cover: The Easy Kernel is Essentially Tight

Stefan Kratsch^{1*}, Geevarghese Philip^{2†} and Saurabh Ray^{3‡}

¹ Technical University Berlin, Germany, stefan.kratsch@tu-berlin.de

² Max-Planck-Institut für Informatik, Saarbrücken, Germany, gphilip@mpi-inf.mpg.de

³ Ben-Gurion University, Israel, saurabh@bgu.ac.il

Abstract

The input to the NP-hard POINT LINE COVER problem (PLC) consists of a set \mathcal{P} of n points on the plane and a positive integer k , and the question is whether there exists a set of at most k lines which pass through all points in \mathcal{P} . By straightforward reduction rules one can efficiently reduce any input to one with at most k^2 points. We show that this easy reduction is already essentially tight under standard assumptions. More precisely, unless the polynomial hierarchy collapses to its third level, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is no polynomial-time algorithm that reduces every instance (\mathcal{P}, k) of PLC to an equivalent instance with $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$ points. This answers, in the negative, an open problem posed by Lokshtanov (PhD Thesis, 2009).

Our proof uses the notion of a kernel from parameterized complexity, and the machinery for deriving lower bounds on the *size* of kernels developed by Dell and van Melkebeek (STOC 2010). It has two main ingredients: We first show, by reduction from VERTEX COVER, that—unless the polynomial hierarchy collapses—PLC has no kernel of *total size* $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$ bits. This does not directly imply the claimed lower bound on the *number of points*, since the best known polynomial-time encoding of a PLC instance with n points requires $\omega(n^2)$ bits. To get around this hurdle we build on work of Goodman, Pollack and Sturmfels (STOC 1989) and devise an *oracle communication protocol* of cost $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ for PLC; its main building block is a bound of $\mathcal{O}(n^{\mathcal{O}(n)})$ for the order types of n points that are not necessarily in general position and an explicit (albeit slow) algorithm that enumerates all possible order types of n points. This protocol, together with the lower bound on the total size (which also holds for such protocols), yields the stated lower bound on the number of points.

While a number of essentially tight polynomial lower bounds on total sizes of kernels are known, our result is—to the best of our knowledge—the first to show a nontrivial lower bound for structural/secondary parameters.

*Supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG), research project PREMOD, KR 4286/1.

†Supported by the Indo-German Max Planck Center for Computer Science(IMPECS).

‡Work done in part while at Max-Planck-Institut für Informatik, Saarbrücken, Germany.

1 Introduction

Recall that a point (a, b) in the two-dimensional plane is said to *lie on* a line $y = mx + c$ if and only if $b = ma + c$ holds.¹ In this case we also say that the line *covers*—or *passes through*—the point, and also, symmetrically, that the point *covers* the line. The POINT LINE COVER (PLC) problem of finding a smallest number ℓ of lines which cover a given set of n points on the plane is motivated by various practical applications [18, 27]. Megiddo and Tamir [27] showed that the problem is NP-hard. Kumar et al. [22] and Brodén et al. [3] showed that the problem is APX-hard, and therefore cannot be approximated to within an arbitrarily small constant factor in polynomial time, unless P=NP. Grantson and Levkopoulos [16] devised an $\mathcal{O}(\log \ell)$ -factor approximation algorithm which runs in polynomial time when $\ell \in \mathcal{O}(n^{1/4})$.

In this work we study the complexity of the decision version where, given a set \mathcal{P} of n points and an integer k , the task is to determine whether the points in \mathcal{P} can be covered by *at most* k lines. While there is no a priori relation between n and k , it is known that one can efficiently reduce to the case where \mathcal{P} contains at most k^2 points: First, any line containing at least $k + 1$ points is *mandatory* if we want to use at most k lines in total. Indeed, the $k + 1$ points on such a line would otherwise require $k + 1$ separate lines since any two lines share at most one point. Thus we may delete any such line and all points which the line covers, and decrease k by one without changing the outcome (**yes** or **no**). Second, if no line contains more than k points, then k lines can cover at most k^2 points. Thus, if $n > k^2$ then we return **no**, and else we have $n \leq k^2$ as claimed. It is a natural and, in our opinion, very interesting question whether this simple reduction process can be improved to yield a significantly better reduction, e.g., to $k^{2-\varepsilon}$ points for some $\varepsilon > 0$. This has been posed as an open problem by Lokshantov [25].

Our main result is a negative answer to Lokshantov’s question.

Theorem 1. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Unless $\text{coNP} \subseteq \text{NP/poly}$, there is no polynomial-time algorithm that reduces every instance (\mathcal{P}, k) of POINT LINE COVER to an equivalent instance with $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$ points.²*

The first part of our result is a lower bound of $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$ on the size of a POINT LINE COVER instance which can be obtained by efficient (reduction) algorithms. For this we use established machinery from parameterized complexity (formal definitions and tools are given in Section 2).

Theorem 2. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$. The POINT LINE COVER problem has no kernel of size $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$, i.e., no polynomial-time reduction to equivalent instances of size $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$, unless $\text{coNP} \subseteq \text{NP/poly}$.*

To get the much more interesting lower bound of Theorem 1 on the number of points we have to relate the number of points in an instance of PLC to the size of the instance, as tightly as possible. The catch here is that there is *no known efficient and sufficiently tight* encoding of PLC-instances with n points into a small—in terms of n —number of bits [15, Section 1]. Further, known tools from parameterized complexity only provide lower bounds on total sizes of kernels. We throw more light on this distinction in our brief discussion on VERTEX COVER later in this section.

Getting around this hurdle is the second component of our result: It is known that point sets *in general position*, i.e., with no three points sharing a line, can be partitioned into $2^{\mathcal{O}(n \log n)}$ equivalence classes (later, and formally, called *order types*) in a combinatorial sense; we extend this fact to arbitrary sets of n points (Lemma 5). The answer (**yes** or **no**) to a PLC instance is determined by the order type of points in the instance. Thus, morally, the relevant information expressed by the coordinates of the n points is only $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ bits. However, no efficient

¹Throughout this work we assume the implicit presence of an arbitrary but fixed Cartesian coordinate system.

²The assumption that $\text{coNP} \not\subseteq \text{NP/poly}$ is backed up by the fact that $\text{coNP} \subseteq \text{NP/poly}$ is known to imply a collapse of the polynomial hierarchy to its third level [31]; it is therefore widely believed.

numbering scheme for order types is known, and hence we do not know how to efficiently compute such a representation with $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ bits. Our solution for this is as follows: First, we prove that order types of point sets are decidable, and devise a computable—albeit inefficient—enumeration scheme, which we believe to be of independent interest.

Lemma 1. *There exists an algorithm which enumerates, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, all order types defined by n points in the plane.*

We then use the fact that the size lower bound of Theorem 2 for POINT LINE COVER also holds in the setting of a two-player communication protocol where the first player holds the input instance but can only communicate a bounded number of bits to an all-powerful oracle that will solve the instance (see Section 2 for definitions). Using our enumeration scheme, the oracle can query the first player about her instance and, effectively, perform a binary search for the order type of the input. This kind of an oracle communication protocol was introduced by Dell and van Melkebeek [8], who developed lower bound techniques for such protocols; they also used such an *active* oracle to answer a question about sparse languages.

Related work. Langerman and Morin [24] showed that POINT LINE COVER is *fixed-parameter tractable* (FPT) with respect to the target number k of lines by giving an algorithm that runs in time $\mathcal{O}^*(k^{2k})$; we use \mathcal{O}^* -notation to hide factors polynomial in the input size. Later, Grantson and Levkopoulos [16] proposed a faster algorithm which solves the problem in time $\mathcal{O}^*((k/2.2)^{2k})$. The fastest FPT algorithm currently known for the problem is due to Wang et al. [30], and it solves the problem in time $\mathcal{O}^*((k/1.35)^k)$.

Langerman and Morin [24] also gave the reduction to at most k^2 points that we outlined earlier. In terms of parameterized complexity this can be seen to lead to a *polynomial kernelization*, using a few standard arguments: Clearly, we are effectively asking for a set cover for the point set (where sets are given by the lines). There are at most k^4 lines and we can encode the points contained in each line using at most k^2 bits; this uses $\mathcal{O}(k^6)$ bits. Since SET COVER is in NP, there is a Karp reduction back to POINT LINE COVER, which gives an equivalent PLC instance of size polynomial in k^6 , i.e., polynomial in k . Estivill-Castro et al. [11] describe a couple of additional reduction rules which, while not improving beyond $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ points, yield kernels which seem to be better amenable to faster subsequent processing by algorithms. See also the PhD thesis of Heednacram [19, Chapter 2] for a survey of related work.

A number of papers build on the work of Dell and van Melkebeek [8] to prove concrete polynomial lower bounds for the *size* of kernelizations for certain problems, e.g., [7, 20, 5]; to the best of our knowledge none of them obtain tight bounds of secondary parameters (other than the number of edges, which is usually an immediate consequence). For other recent developments in kernelization we refer to the survey of Lokshtanov et al. [26].

Vertex cover. To shed more light on the distinction between lower bounds on kernel *sizes* and lower bounds on other, secondary or structural, parameters, let us briefly recall what is known for the well-studied VERTEX COVER problem: It is known how to efficiently reduce VERTEX COVER input instances to equivalent instances with $\mathcal{O}(k)$ vertices and $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ edges [4], and hence to size $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ by adjacency matrix encoding. The breakthrough work of Dell and van Melkebeek [8] showed that no reduction to size $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$ is possible for any $\varepsilon > 0$, unless $\text{coNP} \subseteq \text{NP/poly}$. Since graphs with m edges (and no isolated vertices) can be represented with $\mathcal{O}(m \log m)$ bits this also implies that no reduction to $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$ edges is possible. Similarly, we cannot get to $\mathcal{O}(k^{1-\varepsilon})$ vertices since that would allow an adjacency matrix encoding of size $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-2\varepsilon})$. Contrast this with d -HITTING SET, i.e., VERTEX COVER on hypergraphs with edges of size d , for which the best known reduction achieves $\mathcal{O}(k^{d-1})$ vertices and $\mathcal{O}(k^d)$ hyperedges [1];

Dell and van Melkebeek [8] ruled out size $\mathcal{O}(k^{d-\varepsilon})$. Thus the bound on the number of edges is essentially tight, but the implied lower bound on the number of vertices is much weaker, namely $\mathcal{O}(k^{1-\varepsilon})$. The takeaway message is that lower bounds for secondary parameters can, so far, be only concluded from their effect on the instance size; there are no “direct” lower bound proofs.

Organization of the rest of the paper In the next section we state various definitions and preliminary results. In Section 3 we prove an upper bound of $n^{\mathcal{O}(n)}$ on the number of combinatorially distinct order types of n points in the plane, and show that there is an algorithm which enumerates all order types of n points, thereby proving Lemma 1. In Section 4 we present our reduction from VERTEX COVER to POINT LINE COVER which proves a more general claim than Theorem 2. We describe an oracle communication protocol of cost $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ for POINT LINE COVER in Section 5, and this yields our main result, Theorem 1). We conclude in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

We use $[n]$ to denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Throughout the paper we assume the presence of an arbitrary but fixed Cartesian coordinate system. All geometric objects are referenced in the context of this coordinate system. We use p_x and p_y to denote the x and y coordinates, respectively, of a point p . A set of points in the plane is said to be *in general position* if no three of them are collinear; a set of points which is not in general position is said to be *degenerate*. For two points $p \neq q$ in the plane, we use \overline{pq} to denote the unique line in the plane which passes through p and q ; we say that the line \overline{pq} is *defined* by the pair p, q .

Let a, b, c be three points in the plane. We say that the *orientation* of the ordered triple $\langle a, b, c \rangle$ is $+1$ if the points lie in counter-clockwise position, -1 if they lie in clockwise position and 0 if they are collinear. Formally, let

$$M(\langle a, b, c \rangle) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_x & a_y \\ 1 & b_x & b_y \\ 1 & c_x & c_y \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, $\text{orientation}(\langle a, b, c \rangle) = \text{sgn det } M(\langle a, b, c \rangle)$ where sgn is the sign function and det is the determinant function. Note that the determinant above is zero if and only if the rows are linearly dependent in which case, without loss of generality, $\langle 1, a_x, a_y \rangle = \lambda \langle 1, b_x, b_y \rangle + \mu \langle 1, c_x, c_y \rangle$. Comparing the first coordinates on both sides of the inequality we see that $\mu = 1 - \lambda$ which is equivalent to saying that one of the points is a convex combination of the other two. Hence $\text{orientation}(\langle a, b, c \rangle)$ is zero exactly when a, b , and c are collinear.

Let $\mathcal{P} = \langle p_1, \dots, p_n \rangle$ be an ordered set of points, where $p_i = (x_i, y_i) = \mathcal{P}[i]$. Denote by $\binom{[n]}{3}$ the set of ordered triples $\langle i, j, k \rangle$ where $i < j < k$ and $i, j, k \in [n]$. Define $\sigma : \binom{[n]}{3} \mapsto \{+1, 0, -1\}$ to be the function $\sigma(\langle i, j, k \rangle) = \text{orientation}(p_i, p_j, p_k)$. The function σ is called the *order type* of \mathcal{P} . Observe that the order type of a point set depends on the order of points and not just on the set of points. Two point sets \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} of the same size n are said to be *combinatorially equivalent* if there exist orderings \mathcal{P}' of \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q}' of \mathcal{Q} such that the order types of \mathcal{P}' and \mathcal{Q}' —which are both functions of type $\binom{[n]}{3} \mapsto \{+1, 0, -1\}$ —are identical. Otherwise we say that \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} are *combinatorially distinct*. If two order types come from combinatorially equivalent (distinct) point sets, we call the order types combinatorially equivalent (distinct).

It is not difficult to see that combinatorial distinction is a correct criterion for telling non-equivalent instances of POINT LINE COVER apart.

Lemma 2. *Let $(\mathcal{P}, k), (\mathcal{Q}, k)$ be two instances of POINT LINE COVER. If the point sets \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} are combinatorially equivalent, then (\mathcal{P}, k) and (\mathcal{Q}, k) are equivalent instances of POINT LINE COVER.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} be combinatorially equivalent, let $|\mathcal{P}| = |\mathcal{Q}| = n$, and let $\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{Q}'$ be orderings of \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} , respectively, with identical order types. Observe first that the combinatorial equivalence provides us with a natural bijection $\pi : \mathcal{P} \mapsto \mathcal{Q}$, defined as follows. Let $p \in \mathcal{P}$, and let $i \in [n]$ be such that $\mathcal{P}'[i] = p$. Then $\pi(p) = \mathcal{Q}'[i]$.

For any subset $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}$, let $\pi(T)$ denote the set $\{\pi(t) : t \in T\}$. Let $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ be collinear. For any triple $a, b, c \in \pi(S)$, $\text{orientation}(\langle a, b, c \rangle) = \text{orientation}(\langle \pi^{-1}(a), \pi^{-1}(b), \pi^{-1}(c) \rangle) = 0$ where the first equality follows from the combinatorial equivalence of \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} and the second equality follows from the collinearity of every triple of points in S . This implies that every triple of points in $\pi(S)$ are collinear, which is equivalent to saying that $\pi(S)$ is a collinear subset of \mathcal{Q} . Similarly, since π is a bijection, if $\pi(S)$ is collinear for some $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ then S is also collinear. Thus, S is a collinear subset of \mathcal{P} if and only if $\pi(S)$ is a collinear subset of \mathcal{Q} .

Let (\mathcal{P}, k) be a **yes** instance, and let \mathcal{L} be a set of at most k lines which cover all points in \mathcal{P} . Without loss of generality, each of the lines in \mathcal{L} passes through at least two points in \mathcal{P} since we can always replace a line through a single point by a line through two or more points. For each $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$, denote by S_ℓ the subset of points of \mathcal{P} that ℓ covers. Since S_ℓ is collinear, so is $\pi(S_\ell)$ and thus we can define ℓ' to be the line through $\pi(S_\ell)$. Then, $\mathcal{L}' = \{\ell' : \ell \in \mathcal{L}\}$ covers \mathcal{Q} since for every $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ there is line $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ that covers $\pi^{-1}(q)$. This implies that (\mathcal{Q}, k) is a **yes** instance. Again, since π is a bijection, we have that if (\mathcal{Q}, k) is a **yes** instance then (\mathcal{P}, k) is a **yes** instance. Thus, (\mathcal{P}, k) is a **yes** instance if and only if (\mathcal{Q}, k) is a **yes** instance. \square

Remark 1. For the previous lemma, it is not important that a triple in \mathcal{P} has the same orientation as the corresponding triple (under the bijection π) in \mathcal{Q} . It is sufficient to ensure that a triple in \mathcal{P} has orientation 0 iff the corresponding triple has orientation 0. We could define and use a coarser notion of equivalence based on this but we choose to stick to order types since they are well studied.

We need the following straightforward polynomial-time construction of point sets with some special properties for our reduction in Section 4:

Lemma 3. *For any positive integer n we can construct, in time polynomial in n , a set $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ of n points with the following properties:*

1. *The set of points \mathcal{P} is in general position;*
2. *No two lines defined by pairs of points in \mathcal{P} are parallel; and,*
3. *No three lines defined by pairs of points in \mathcal{P} pass through a common point outside \mathcal{P} .*

Proof. We describe a polynomial-time construction of such a point set. The construction is trivial when $n = 1$. Assume that a set \mathcal{P}' of $1 \leq t < n$ points with these properties has been constructed. Observe that all the points which are “forbidden” by the set \mathcal{P}' —that is, points which cannot be added to the set \mathcal{P}' without violating one of the three properties—lie on a bounded number of lines. For instance, the first property is violated if and only if a new point lies on one of the $\binom{t}{2}$ lines defined by pairs of points in \mathcal{P}' . Similarly, the second and third conditions forbid points which lie on sets of $\mathcal{O}(t^3)$ and $\mathcal{O}(t^5)$ lines, respectively. Further, we can compute all these lines in polynomial time by enumerating all possibilities.

We augment the set \mathcal{P}' by choosing a point which is not on one of these lines. To facilitate this we pick all our points from a grid of size $n^6 \times n^6$. As we argued above, only $\mathcal{O}(n^5)$ lines are forbidden at any point during the construction. Each of these lines intersects the $n^6 \times n^6$ grid in $\mathcal{O}(n^6)$ points. Thus at most $\mathcal{O}(n^{11})$ of the n^{12} grid points are forbidden at any time, and we augment \mathcal{P}' with a point on the grid which is not forbidden. Our construction consists of repeating this step n times, and takes polynomial time. \square

Graphs. All graphs in this article are finite, simple, undirected, and loopless. In general we follow the graph terminology of Diestel’s textbook on the subject [9]. The (open) neighborhood $N_G(v)$ of a vertex v in a graph G is the set of all vertices u of G such that u and v are adjacent. A *vertex cover* of a graph G is a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ of the vertex set of G such that for every edge e of G , there is at least one vertex in S which is incident with e .

Parameterized complexity. A parameterized problem \mathcal{A} is a subset of $\Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ for some finite alphabet Σ ; the second component of instances $(x, k) \in \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is called the *parameter*. A *kernelization algorithm* for problem \mathcal{A} is an algorithm that given $(x, k) \in \Sigma^*$ takes time polynomial in $|x| + k$ and outputs an equivalent instance (x', k') of \mathcal{A} —that is, one which preserves the **yes/no** answer—such that $|x'|, k'$ are both bounded by some function h of k ; this function is called the *size* of the kernelization [10, 12, 28]. If h is polynomially bounded then we have a *polynomial kernelization*. One of the most important (fairly) recent results in kernelization is a framework for ruling out polynomial kernels for certain problems, assuming that $\text{coNP} \not\subseteq \text{NP/poly}$ [2, 13].

Our work uses an extension of the lower bound framework that is due to Dell and van Melkebeek [8]. Their work provided the first tool to prove concrete polynomial lower bounds on the possible size of kernelizations. In fact, their lower bounds are proven for an abstraction of kernelization as oracle communication protocols of bounded cost; the lower bounds carry over immediately. (For intuition, the first player could run a kernelization with size h and send the outcome to the oracle, who decides the instance, obtaining a protocol of cost $h(k)$ for deciding $(x, k) \in \mathcal{A}$. Of course, having a multi-round communication or using an active oracle that queries the user appears to be more general than kernelization.)

Definition 1 (Oracle Communication Protocol). An oracle communication protocol for a language L is a communication protocol between two players. The first player is given the input x and has to run in time polynomial in the length of the input; the second player is computationally unbounded but is not given any part of x . At the end of the protocol the first player should be able to decide whether $x \in L$. The *cost* of the protocol is the number of bits of communication from the first player to the second player.

Our lower bound for the *size* of kernels for POINT LINE COVER will follow from a reduction from the well-known NP-hard VERTEX COVER problem (cf. [21]). We recall the problem setting.

VERTEX COVER

Input: A graph G , and a positive integer k .

Question: Does the graph G have a vertex cover of size at most k ?

Parameter: k

The smallest known kernel for the problem has at most $(2k - c \log k)$ vertices for any fixed constant c [23]. This kernel can have $\Omega(k^2)$ edges, and so the total *size* of the kernel is $\Omega(k^2)$, and not $\mathcal{O}(k)$. Dell and van Melkebeek [8] showed that this is—in a certain sense—the best possible upper bound on the kernel size for VERTEX COVER. In fact, they proved much more general lower bounds about the cost of a communication process used to decide languages.

Theorem 3 ([8, Theorem 2]). *Let $d \geq 2$ be an integer, and ε a positive real. If $\text{coNP} \not\subseteq \text{NP/poly}$, then there is no protocol of cost $\mathcal{O}(n^{d-\varepsilon})$ to decide whether a d -uniform hypergraph on n vertices has a vertex cover of at most k vertices, even when the first player is conondeterministic.*

We will use the immediate corollary that VERTEX COVER admits no oracle communication protocol of cost $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$ for deciding whether a graph G has a vertex cover of size at most k (and hence also no kernelization of that size), for any $\varepsilon > 0$, unless $\text{coNP} \subseteq \text{NP/poly}$.

The POINT LINE COVER problem. A formal statement of the central problem of this paper is as follows:

POINT LINE COVER

Input: A set of n points \mathcal{P} in the plane, and a positive integer k .

Question: Is there a set of at most k lines in the plane which cover all the points in \mathcal{P} ?

Parameter: k

We use the following “dual” problem to POINT LINE COVER in our proof of Theorem 2. In the input to this problem, each line in the set \mathcal{L} is given as a pair $(m, c) \subseteq \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}$ where m is the slope of the line and c its Y -intercept.

LINE POINT COVER

Input: A set of n lines \mathcal{L} in the plane, and a positive integer k .

Question: Is there a set of at most k points in the plane which cover all the lines in \mathcal{L} ?

Parameter: k

There is a polynomial-time, parameter-preserving reduction from the dual to the primal:

Lemma 4. *There is a polynomial-time reduction from the LINE POINT COVER problem to the POINT LINE COVER problem which preserves the parameter k . That is, the reduction takes an instance (\mathcal{L}, k) of LINE POINT COVER to an equivalent instance (\mathcal{P}, k) of POINT LINE COVER.*

Proof. The lemma follows from a well known duality of point and lines (see e.g., [6]). Given a set of points $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ and a set of lines $\mathcal{L} = \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m\}$, one can obtain lines $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} = \{\tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_n\}$ and points $\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = \{\tilde{\ell}_1, \dots, \tilde{\ell}_m\}$ such that the point $\tilde{\ell}_i$ lies on the line \tilde{p}_j if and only if the point p_j lies on the line ℓ_i . In other words, each line can be replaced by a point and each point can be replaced by a line while preserving the incidences between lines and points.

To see this, first note that it can be assumed without loss of generality that none of the given lines ℓ_i is vertical. This can be easily done by a suitable rotation of the coordinate system since there are only a finite number of directions for the y -axis to avoid. Next note that a point (a, b) lies on a line $y = mx + c$ if and only if the point $(m, -c)$ lies on the line $y = ax - b$ since both conditions are equivalent to $b = ma + c$. Thus if $p_i = (a_i, b_i)$, we can take \tilde{p}_i to be the line $y = a_i x - b_i$ and if ℓ_j is the line $y = m_j x + c_j$, we can take $\tilde{\ell}_j$ to be the point $(m_j, -c_j)$. This transformation can be done in polynomial time for any reasonable representation of rational numbers.

The above “point-line duality” implies that (\mathcal{L}, k) and $(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}, k)$ are equivalent instances of LINE POINT COVER and POINT LINE COVER respectively. \square

3 Enumerating Order Types

Goodman and Pollack [14] proved that the number of combinatorially distinct order types on n points in general position is $\mathcal{O}(n^{4n(1+o(1))})$. Using this we prove an upper bound on the number of all order types on n points, including those that come from point sets not in general position. We defer the proof of the following lemma to the end of this section.

Lemma 5. *There are at most $n^{\mathcal{O}(n)}$ combinatorially distinct order types defined by n points in \mathbb{R}^2 .*

Thus there are only $2^{\mathcal{O}(n \log n)}$ combinatorially distinct instances of the POINT LINE COVER problem with n points—see Lemma 2. In this section we consider the algorithmic problem of enumerating all order types of n -point sets; we need such an algorithm for proving our lower bound in Section 5. Note that we do not need an *efficient* algorithm; we only need to show that

there is an algorithm which solves the problem and terminates in finite time for each n . Given this, a first approach would be to consider a large enough $N = f(n)$ and produce the order type of every set of n points whose coordinates are integers in $[N]$. The hope here would be that every order type comes from some point set whose points have coordinates of finite precision. Unfortunately, this is not true: there are order types σ which cannot be realized by point sets with rational coordinates [15]. We need a somewhat more sophisticated argument to prove Lemma 1.

Proof of Lemma 1. Goodman et al. [15] show that for any function σ which is the order type of some (unknown) set of n points *in general position*, there exists an ordered set \mathcal{P} of n points in the plane such that (i) the order type of \mathcal{P} is σ , and (ii) each point in \mathcal{P} has integer coordinates in $[2^{2^{\mathcal{O}(n)}}]$. We show that by modifying their proof to work with the more general notion of an order type of *cells* rather than points we can *enumerate* all order types of n points, including those which correspond to degenerate point sets.

We start with a brief overview of the proof of Goodman et al. We are given a function $\sigma : \binom{[n]}{3} \mapsto \{-1, +1\}$ which is the order type of some point set in general position. The goal is to show that there exists an ordered point set $\mathcal{P} = \langle p_1, \dots, p_n \rangle$ with order type σ such that the coordinates of the points p_i are integers of magnitude $2^{2^{\mathcal{O}(n)}}$. We first find an ordered point set $\mathcal{Q} = \langle q_1, \dots, q_n \rangle$ whose order type is σ —but which may have points with non-integral coordinates—and then modify \mathcal{Q} to obtain \mathcal{P} . Let x_i and y_i be variables which stand for the x and y coordinates of q_i . Let $\Delta(\langle i, j, k \rangle) = \det M(\langle q_i, q_j, q_k \rangle)$. Our variables must satisfy the set of equations $\text{sgn } \Delta(\langle i, j, k \rangle) = \sigma(i, j, k) \forall \langle i, j, k \rangle \in \binom{[n]}{3}$, which can be rewritten as $\Delta(\langle i, j, k \rangle) \cdot \sigma(i, j, k) > 0 \forall \langle i, j, k \rangle \in \binom{[n]}{3}$. This set of equations can safely³ be replaced by $\Delta(\langle i, j, k \rangle) \cdot \sigma(i, j, k) \geq 1 \forall \langle i, j, k \rangle \in \binom{[n]}{3}$. Since we started with the assumption that σ is the order type of some point set, we know that this set of inequalities has a solution. Observe that this is a set of inequalities of degree two where the coefficients have bit length 1. Hence, by a result of Grigor’ev and Vorobjov [17] they have a solution $\mathcal{Q} = \langle q_1, \dots, q_n \rangle \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ within a ball of radius $2^{2^{\mathcal{O}(n)}}$ around the origin. It can be shown that the minimum distance between a point in \mathcal{Q} and the line determined by two other points in \mathcal{Q} is bounded away from 0, and that the minimum angle defined by three points in \mathcal{Q} is bounded away from 0. This is because (i) the determinants in our inequalities have magnitude at least 1, and (ii) the points in \mathcal{Q} lie inside a ball of bounded radius. It follows that moving these points by small distances does not change their order type, and so each of these points can be moved to a point whose coordinates are integral multiples of some $\ell \in 2^{-2^{\mathcal{O}(n)}}$. By scaling up we get integral coordinates of magnitude at most $2^{2^{\mathcal{O}(n)}}$. This gives us the required set \mathcal{P} .

This strategy breaks down when σ is an order type of a *degenerate* point set. To see why, let us consider the order type σ of a degenerate point set and proceed exactly as above. Since we now have collinear triples, our set of inequalities has the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\langle i, j, k \rangle) \cdot \sigma(i, j, k) &\geq 1 \quad \forall \langle i, j, k \rangle \in \binom{[n]}{3} \text{ s.t. } \sigma(i, j, k) \neq 0 \\ \Delta(\langle i, j, k \rangle) &= 0 \quad \forall \langle i, j, k \rangle \in \binom{[n]}{3} \text{ s.t. } \sigma(i, j, k) = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

and the Grigor’ev-Vorobjov bound still holds. The problem arises in the step where we move some point slightly to make its coordinates multiples of $\ell \in 2^{-2^{\mathcal{O}(n)}}$. While this cannot make a clockwise triple counter-clockwise or *vice versa*, it could easily destroy the collinearity of triples and thus violate the set of equations.

³See the paper of Goodman et al. [15] for all technical details.

To get around this problem, we replace points with bigger regions in the argument. We first extend the notion of orientation from triples of points to triples of convex regions in the plane, as follows. Let $r_a, r_b,$ and r_c be three convex regions in the plane. We assign an orientation $+1$ (resp. -1) to the triple $\langle r_a, r_b, r_c \rangle$ if for each choice of points $p_a \in r_a, p_b \in r_b,$ and $p_c \in r_c$ the triple $\langle p_a, p_b, p_c \rangle$ has orientation $+1$ (resp. -1). If a triple $\langle r_a, r_b, r_c \rangle$ is not assigned an orientation according to this rule then we assign it the orientation 0 ; this happens if and only if there is a line intersecting the three regions. As with points, we define an order type for an ordered set of regions $\langle r_1, \dots, r_n \rangle$ to be the function σ which satisfies $\sigma(\langle i, j, k \rangle) = \text{orientation}(r_i, r_j, r_k)$.

Once we have a solution $\mathcal{Q} = \langle q_1, \dots, q_n \rangle \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ to the inequalities (1) as described above, we superimpose a grid with cells of side length $2^{-2^{\mathcal{O}(n)}}$ onto the coordinate system. For each $q_i \in \mathcal{Q}$, we take r_i to be the cell in which the point q_i lies. Observe that the order type of these r_i 's is the same as the order type of the q_i 's. This can be seen as follows. Whenever a triple $\langle q_{i_1}, q_{i_2}, q_{i_3} \rangle$ of points in \mathcal{Q} have non-zero orientation, any three points a, b, c lying in the cells $r_{i_1}, r_{i_2},$ and r_{i_3} respectively have the same orientation since, as argued before, moving the points slightly does not change orientation. Also, if a triple of points has orientation 0 then the corresponding cells have orientation 0 by definition. As before, we can scale up the grid so that the r_i 's are cells of side length 1 whose corners have integer coordinates. It follows that we can enumerate all order types defined by n points by (i) taking an integer grid of size $2^{2^{\mathcal{O}(n)}}$, and (ii) listing all order types defined by some n -subset of the cells in this grid. \square

Proof of Lemma 5. For any given order type defined by an ordered point set $P = \langle p_1, \dots, p_n \rangle$, we show that there is an ordered set of $2n$ points in general position whose order type encodes the order type of P . Together with the Goodman-Pollack bound, this shows that the number of combinatorially distinct order types defined by any set of n points (not necessarily in general position) is $n^{\mathcal{O}(n)}$.

We use the ideas described in the proof of Lemma 1. As we did there, we obtain points q_1, \dots, q_n so that (i) the order type of $\langle q_1, \dots, q_n \rangle$ is the same as that of $\langle p_1, \dots, p_n \rangle$ and (ii) moving q_i inside a small cell r_i around it does not change orientations of triples with non-zero orientations. If required we also shift the superimposed grid in such a way that no point q_i lies on the boundary of the corresponding region r_i . For each point q_i , we pick a line segment s_i containing q_i such that (i) the end-points of s_i lie in r_i and (ii) the $2n$ end-points of these segments are in general position. Such segments can be found by picking the end-points one by one. We always pick them inside the appropriate region to satisfy the first condition and when we pick the next one, there are only a finite number of lines to avoid in order satisfy the second condition. As before, we get that the order type of the ordered segment set $\langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle$ is the same as that of the ordered point set $\langle p_1, \dots, p_n \rangle$. Denote the end-points of s_i by s_i^1 and s_i^2 . Then, for any triple of points $\langle p_i, p_j, p_k \rangle$ with orientation $+1$ all the eight triples of the form $\langle s_i^u, s_j^v, s_k^w \rangle$ where $u, v, w \in \{1, 2\}$ have the orientation $+1$. The same holds for triples with orientation -1 . Furthermore, for any triple $\langle p_i, p_j, p_k \rangle$ with orientation 0 , the eight triples *do not* have the same orientation. To see this, consider the line ℓ through $q_i, q_j,$ and q_k . Clearly ℓ intersects the segments $s_i, s_j,$ and s_k . We move ℓ parallel to itself until it passes through an end-point x of one of the segments, say s_i , for the first time. (We skip the parallel move if ℓ is collinear with a segment and just let x be either endpoint. Note that by general position of segment endpoints no further endpoints are on ℓ in this case.) Then, keeping this point x fixed we rotate ℓ , if required, until it passes through the end-point of another segment, say s_j , for the first time. (We skip rotation if the parallel move already hit two segment endpoints; as they are in general position we cannot hit three at the same time.) The line ℓ still intersects s_k and therefore the two end-points of s_k are on opposite sides of ℓ (neither of them can be on ℓ since we assumed that the




Figure 1: Reduction, phase one.

set of end-points is in general position). Thus $\text{orientation}(\langle x, y, s_k^1 \rangle) \neq \text{orientation}(\langle x, y, s_k^2 \rangle)$.

Thus, given the orientations of ordered triples in the set $\{s_1^1, s_1^2, \dots, s_n^1, s_n^2\}$ we can deduce the orientations of ordered triples in $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$. Hence the order type of $\langle s_1^1, s_1^2, \dots, s_n^1, s_n^2 \rangle$ encodes the order type of $\langle p_1, \dots, p_n \rangle$. \square

4 Lower Bound on Kernel Size

In this section we prove Theorem 2. The main component of our proof is a polynomial-time reduction from VERTEX COVER to LINE POINT COVER in which the parameter value is exactly doubled.

Lemma 6. *There is a polynomial-time reduction from VERTEX COVER to LINE POINT COVER which maps instances (G, k) of VERTEX COVER to equivalent instances $(\mathcal{L}, 2k)$ of LINE POINT COVER.*

Proof. Given an instance (G, k) of VERTEX COVER with $n := |V(G)|$ and $m := |E(G)|$, we construct an equivalent instance $(\mathcal{L}, 2k)$ of LINE POINT COVER in two phases.

In the first phase we construct a graph G' such that G' has a vertex cover of size at most $2k$ if and only if G has a vertex cover of size at most k . To do this, we first make two copies G_0, G_1 of the graph G . For a vertex $v \in V(G)$, let v_0, v_1 denote its copies in G_0 and G_1 , respectively. For each edge $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$, we add the two edges $\{u_0, v_1\}, \{u_1, v_0\}$ to G' . This completes the construction. Note that there are *four* edges in G' which correspond to each edge in G : these consist of the two copies of the edge “within” G_0 and G_1 , and the two edges “across” G_0 and G_1 added in the second step. Formally, we set $V(G') = \{v_0, v_1 \mid v \in V(G)\}$, and $E(G') = \{\{u_i, v_j\} \mid i, j \in \{0, 1\} \wedge \{u, v\} \in E(G)\}$; see Figure 1. As we show in Claim 1, G' has a vertex cover of size at most $2k$ if and only if G has a vertex cover of size at most k .

In the second phase we start with the graph G' which is the output of the first phase, and construct a set \mathcal{L} of lines in the plane. We do this in such a way that there is a set of at most $2k$ points in the plane which cover all the lines in \mathcal{L} if and only if the graph G' has a vertex cover of size at most $2k$. We start by constructing a set of $2n$ points⁴ $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_{2n}\}$ in the plane which has the following properties:

1. The set of points \mathcal{P} is in general position;
2. No two lines defined by pairs of points in \mathcal{P} are parallel; and,
3. No three lines defined by pairs of points in \mathcal{P} pass through a common point *outside* \mathcal{P} .

⁴These points will *not* be part of the reduced instance.

By Lemma 3, we can construct the set \mathcal{P} in time polynomial in n .

We associate, in an arbitrary fashion, a distinct point $P_v \in \mathcal{P}$ with each vertex $v \in V(G')$. We initialize \mathcal{L} to be the empty set. Now for each edge $\{u, v\}$ of G' , we add the line $L_{uv} = \overline{P_u P_v}$ to \mathcal{L} . This completes the construction; $(\mathcal{L}, 2k)$ is the reduced instance of LINE POINT COVER. We now show that this is indeed a reduction.

Completeness. Assume that the starting instance (G, k) of VERTEX COVER is **yes**. This implies—Claim 1—that $(G', 2k)$ is **yes**, and it suffices to show that $(\mathcal{L}, 2k)$ is **yes** for LINE POINT COVER. Let $S \subseteq V(G')$ with $|S| \leq 2k$ be a vertex cover of G' . Consider the set $\mathcal{Q} = \{P_v \mid v \in S\}$ of at most $2k$ points in the plane. By construction, any line $L \in \mathcal{L}$ is of the form $L = \overline{P_u P_v}$ for some $u, v \in V(G')$ with $\{u, v\} \in E(G')$. Since S is a vertex cover of G' , we know that $S \cap \{u, v\} \neq \emptyset$. Hence $\mathcal{Q} \cap \{P_u, P_v\} \neq \emptyset$, and so \mathcal{Q} contains a point which covers the line L . It follows that \mathcal{Q} is a line point cover for \mathcal{L} of size at most $2k$ and that $(\mathcal{L}, 2k)$ is **yes** for LINE POINT COVER.

Soundness. Now suppose $(\mathcal{L}, 2k)$ is **yes** for LINE POINT COVER. Note that in general, a solution for $(\mathcal{L}, 2k)$ could contain points which do not belong to the set \mathcal{P} that we used for the construction; these points do not correspond to vertices of G' . Indeed, any pair of lines in \mathcal{L} meet at a point, but not every pair of edges in G' share a vertex. We show that there exists a solution for $(\mathcal{L}, 2k)$ which consists entirely of points which correspond to vertices in G' . We start with a *smallest* solution \mathcal{Q} ; $|\mathcal{Q}| \leq 2k$ of $(\mathcal{L}, 2k)$ which has a *minimum number* of points that do not correspond to vertices of G' , i.e., with as few points $P \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{P}$ as possible. Let us call all points not in \mathcal{P} *bad points*; points in \mathcal{P} are *good points*. We define $S(\mathcal{Q}) := \{v \in V(G') \mid P_v \in \mathcal{Q}\}$ as the set of vertices of G' that correspond to good points which are in \mathcal{Q} .

Suppose \mathcal{Q} contains a bad point P . Since \mathcal{Q} is a smallest solution, there is at least one line in \mathcal{L} which (i) is covered by P , and (ii) is not covered by any other point in \mathcal{Q} . If there is exactly one such line, say $\overline{P_u P_v}$, then we may replace P by P_u or P_v in \mathcal{Q} and reduce the number of bad points, a contradiction. Now from the third property of the point set \mathcal{P} and from the fact that every line in \mathcal{L} is defined by some pair of points in \mathcal{P} , we get that point P covers *exactly* two lines, say $L_1, L_2 \in \mathcal{L}$, and that these are not covered by other points of \mathcal{Q} .

We now examine the structure around line L_1 more closely. We know that $L_1 = \overline{P_{u_i} P_{v_j}}$ for some $u_i, v_j \in V(G')$ with $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$. We assume for the sake of convenience that $i = j = 0$, so that $L_1 = \overline{P_{u_0} P_{v_0}}$; a symmetric argument works when $i = j = 1$ or $i \neq j$. Since P is the only point in \mathcal{Q} which covers L_1 , we know that $P_{u_0}, P_{v_0} \notin \mathcal{Q}$ and hence that $u_0, v_0 \notin S(\mathcal{Q})$. We also know from the construction that (i) $\{\overline{P_{u_i} P_{v_j}}; i, j \in \{0, 1\}\} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ and (ii) $\{\{u_i, v_j\}; i, j \in \{0, 1\}\} \subseteq E(G')$. For any vertex $v \in V(G') \setminus S(\mathcal{Q})$ the stated minimal properties of \mathcal{Q} imply—see Claim 2—that $|N_{G'}(v) \setminus S(\mathcal{Q})| \leq 1$, and so we get that $N_{G'}(v_0) \setminus S(\mathcal{Q}) = \{u_0\}$ and $N_{G'}(u_0) \setminus S(\mathcal{Q}) = \{v_0\}$. It follows that $v_1 \in S(\mathcal{Q})$ and that P_{v_1} is a good point in \mathcal{Q} .

By construction we have that $N_{G'}(v_0) = N_{G'}(v_1)$, and hence that $N_{G'}(v_1) \setminus S(\mathcal{Q}) = \{u_0\}$. From the first property of the point set \mathcal{P} we get that the lines in \mathcal{L} which are covered by the point P_{v_1} all correspond to edges of G' which are at v_1 . It follows that the set $\mathcal{Q}' = (\mathcal{Q} \setminus \{P_{v_1}\}) \cup \{P_{u_0}\}$ covers all lines in \mathcal{L} since it contains the corresponding points P_w for all neighbors w of v_1 . Now (i) $|\mathcal{Q}'| = |\mathcal{Q}|$, (ii) $P \in \mathcal{Q}'$, (iii) \mathcal{Q}' has the same number of good points as \mathcal{Q} , and (iv) the good points in \mathcal{Q}' cover all the lines that were covered by the good points of \mathcal{Q} , and in addition they cover $L_1 = \overline{P_{u_0} P_{v_0}}$. Hence there is at most one line in \mathcal{L} —namely, L_2 —which (i) is covered by P , and (ii) is not covered by any other point in \mathcal{Q}' . By previous arguments this contradicts the minimality of \mathcal{Q}' and hence of \mathcal{Q} .

It follows that there is a set \mathcal{Q} of at most $2k$ points which (i) covers all the lines in \mathcal{L} and (ii) has only good points. We claim that $S(\mathcal{Q})$ is a vertex cover of G' of size at most $2k$: For any edge $\{u, v\} \in E(G')$, the corresponding line in \mathcal{L} is covered by a good point in \mathcal{Q} , so it is covered by P_u or P_v . Thus $S(\mathcal{Q})$ contains u or v , and $|S(\mathcal{Q})| = |\mathcal{Q}| \leq 2k$. It follows that $(G', 2k)$ and hence also (G, k) are **yes** for VERTEX COVER.

Wrap-up. It is not difficult to see that the first phase of the reduction can be done in polynomial time, and we have argued that the second phase can also be done in polynomial time. \square

We now prove the claims which we use in the proof of Lemma 6.

Claim 1. *Let G be any graph, and let G' be the graph obtained from G by applying the construction from the first phase of the reduction in the proof of Lemma 6. Then G has a vertex cover of size at most k if and only if G' has a vertex cover of size at most $2k$.*

Proof. For the forward direction, let $S \subseteq V(G)$ be a vertex cover of G , of size at most k . Then $S' = \{v_0, v_1 \mid v \in S\}$ is a vertex cover of G' , of size at most $2k$. Since S' contains exactly two vertices for each vertex of S , we have that $|S'| = 2|S| \leq 2k$. To see that S' is a vertex cover of G' , assume for the sake of contradiction that an edge $\{x, y\}$ of G' is not covered by S' . There are four cases to consider, which reduce by symmetry to the following two.

1. Both end points of the edge $\{x, y\}$ belong to the subgraph G_0 of G . (A symmetric argument holds when both x and y belong to the subgraph G_1 .) Then from the construction, there is an edge $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$ such that $x = u_0, y = v_0$. Since neither x nor y is in S' , it follows from the construction of S' that neither of $\{u, v\}$ is in S .
2. Vertices x and y belong to two distinct subgraphs $G_i; i \in \{0, 1\}$. Without loss of generality, let $x \in V(G_0), y \in V(G_1)$. Observe that the construction adds such an edge $\{x, y\}$ to G' exactly when (i) there is an edge $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$, and (ii) $(x = u_0, y = v_1) \vee (x = v_0, y = u_1)$. In either case, since neither x nor y is in S' , it follows from the construction of S' from S that neither of $\{u, v\}$ is in S .

In each case, S does not cover the edge $\{u, v\}$ in G , a contradiction.

For the reverse direction, let $S' \subseteq V(G')$ be an *inclusion-minimal* vertex cover of G' , of size at most $2k$. If G' has a vertex cover of size at most $2k$, then it certainly has a minimal vertex cover of size at most $2k$. We first show that for any vertex $u \in V(G)$, either (i) both the copies u_0, u_1 are in S' , or (ii) neither copy is in S' . Suppose not, and exactly one of these, say u_0 , is in S' . Since S' is a minimal vertex cover, u_0 covers at least one edge, and so the neighborhood $N(u_0)$ of u_0 is non-empty. Now, from the construction of G' we get that $N(u_0) = N(u_1)$, and since $u_1 \notin S'$, it follows that *all* vertices in $N(u_1) = N(u_0)$ must be in S' . But then $S' \setminus \{u_0\}$ is a strictly smaller vertex cover of G' , a contradiction.

Thus S' can be partitioned into pairs of vertices $\{\{u_0, u_1\} \mid u \in S \subseteq V(G)\}$. We claim that S is a vertex cover of graph G , of size at most k . The claim on size follows immediately from the construction of S . To see that S is a vertex cover of G , observe that if $\{x, y\} \in E(G)$ and $\{x, y\} \cap S = \emptyset$, then (i) $\{x_0, x_1, y_0, y_1\} \cap S' = \emptyset$ by the construction of S and (ii) all the four edges $\{\{x_i, y_i\} \mid i \in \{0, 1\}\}$ are in $E(G')$ by the construction of G' , which together contradict the assumption that S' is a vertex cover of G' . \square

Claim 2. *Let $(\mathcal{L}, 2k)$ be an instance of LINE POINT COVER constructed as in the second phase of the reduction in the proof of Lemma 6. Let \mathcal{P}, G', P_v be as in the construction, and let \mathcal{Q} be a smallest set of points which (i) cover all the lines in \mathcal{L} and (ii) has as few points $P \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{P}$ as possible. Let $S(\mathcal{Q}) := \{v \in V(G') \mid P_v \in \mathcal{Q}\}$. Then for any vertex $v \in V(G') \setminus S(\mathcal{Q})$ we have that $|N_{G'}(v) \setminus S(\mathcal{Q})| \leq 1$.*

Proof. We reuse the notation and terminology defined in the proof of Lemma 6. Suppose a vertex $v \in V(G') \setminus S(\mathcal{Q})$ has two neighbours u, w which are not in $S(\mathcal{Q})$. Then the lines $L_1 = \overline{P_v P_u}$ and $L_2 = \overline{P_v P_w}$ which intersect at the good point P_v are covered by two bad points—say P_1, P_2 , respectively—in \mathcal{Q} . By an argument presented in the proof of Lemma 6 we

know that each of P_1, P_2 covers exactly two lines in \mathcal{L} , and that these lines are not covered by any other point in \mathcal{Q} . Let L_i, L'_i be the two lines covered by P_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and let P' be the intersection of L'_1 and L'_2 . Thus the two bad points P_1, P_2 together cover the subset $\{L_i, L'_i \mid i \in \{1, 2\}\}$ of \mathcal{L} , but so do the two points P_v, P' of which at most one is a bad point. Thus $(\mathcal{Q} \setminus \{P_1, P_2\}) \cup \{P_v, P'\}$ is a smallest set of points which (i) cover all the lines in \mathcal{L} and (ii) has strictly fewer bad points than \mathcal{Q} , a contradiction. \square

Using Lemma 6 we can prove a stronger statement than Theorem 2.

Theorem 4. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$. The POINT LINE COVER problem admits no oracle communication protocol of cost $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$ for deciding instances (\mathcal{P}, k) , unless $\text{coNP} \subseteq \text{NP/poly}$.*

Proof. Suppose POINT LINE COVER admits an oracle communication protocol of cost $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$ that decides any instance (\mathcal{P}, k) . Lemma 4 then yields a protocol of the same cost for LINE POINT COVER. Combining this with the reduction from VERTEX COVER to LINE POINT COVER from Lemma 6 which has a linear parameter increase (i.e., $k \mapsto 2k$), we get a protocol of cost $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$ for deciding VERTEX COVER instances (G, k) . Theorem 3 now implies $\text{coNP} \subseteq \text{NP/poly}$, as claimed. \square

Theorem 2 is now immediate.

Proof of Theorem 2. If POINT LINE COVER has a kernel of size $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$, then the polynomially-bounded first player in the oracle communication protocol could compute this kernel and send it to the second player who, being computationally unbounded, can compute and return the correct one-bit answer (**yes** or **no**). The cost of this protocol is $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$, and by Theorem 4 this implies $\text{coNP} \subseteq \text{NP/poly}$. \square

5 Lower bound on the number of points

In this section we prove our main result, namely that the straightforward reduction of POINT LINE COVER instances (\mathcal{P}, k) to k^2 points cannot be significantly improved. Recall that, unlike for VERTEX COVER, we do not know of an efficient encoding of POINT LINE COVER to instances of near linear size in the number of points. In the case of VERTEX COVER it is straightforward to encode instances with m edges using $\mathcal{O}(m \log m)$ bits. Together with the known $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$ lower bound on kernel size [8], this implies an $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$ lower bound on the number of edges for VERTEX COVER kernels. Obtaining an efficient encoding of POINT LINE COVER to instances of near linear size in the number of points is an old open problem in computational geometry [15]. The following lemma gets around this handicap by providing an oracle communication protocol of cost near linear in the number of points.

Lemma 7. *There is an oracle communication protocol of cost $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ for deciding instances of POINT LINE COVER with n points.*

Proof. We describe the claimed oracle communication protocol for deciding POINT LINE COVER instances. The polynomially-bounded player holding the input is called Alice, and the computationally unbounded player is called Bob. Recall that by Definition 1 the cost of a protocol is the number of bits sent from Alice to Bob; in contrast, Bob can send any amount of information to Alice (who, however, has only polynomial time in the input size for reading it).

Alice and Bob both use the following scheme to represent order types as strings over the alphabet $\{+1, 0, -1\}$. Recall that the order type of an ordered set of n points $\mathcal{P} = \langle 1, \dots, n \rangle$ is a certain function $\sigma : \binom{[n]}{3} \mapsto \{+1, 0, -1\}$. To form the string representing σ , we first arrange the

set $\binom{[n]}{3}$ in increasing lexicographic order to get a list \mathcal{L} . Then we replace each $x \in \mathcal{L}$ by $\sigma(x)$. This gives us the desired string; we denote it the Order Type Representation of the ordered set, or OTR for short. Observe that each OTR can be encoded using $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ bits.

From Lemma 5 we know that the number of combinatorially distinct order types of n -point sets is $n^{\mathcal{O}(n)}$. Since for each order type there are at most $n!$ other order types combinatorially equivalent to it, the number of different order types of n -point sets is at most $n! \cdot n^{\mathcal{O}(n)} = n^{\mathcal{O}(n)}$. This indicates that the pertinent information which Alice holds is $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ bits. But we do not know of a polynomial-time procedure which encodes this information into these many bits, and so Alice cannot just employ such an encoding and send the result to Bob for him to solve the instance. We use the following protocol to get around this problem.

1. Alice sends the value n of the number of points in the input set to Bob in binary encoding.
2. Alice fixes an arbitrary ordering of the input point set. She then computes the OTR of this ordered set.
3. Bob generates a list of all $n^{\mathcal{O}(n)}$ possible order types; by Lemma 1 this is a computable task. He then computes the OTRs of these order types and sorts them in lexicographically increasing order.
4. Alice and Bob now engage in a conversation where Bob uses binary search on the sorted list to locate the OTR which Alice holds. Bob sends the median OTR M in his list to Alice. Alice replies, in two bits, whether the OTR she holds is smaller, equal to, or larger than M in lexicographic order. If the answer is not “equal”, Bob prunes his list accordingly, throwing out all OTRs which cannot be the one held by Alice. By repeating this procedure $\mathcal{O}(\log(n^{\mathcal{O}(n)})) = \mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ times, Bob is left with a single OTR S which is identical to the one held by Alice.
5. Bob now computes the size of a smallest point-line cover of any point set which has the order type S , and sends this number to Alice. Alice compares this number with the input k and answers **yes** or **no** accordingly.

It is not difficult to see that Alice can do her part of this procedure in polynomial time, and that all tasks which Bob has to do are computable. The total cost of the protocol is $\log n + \mathcal{O}(n \log n) = \mathcal{O}(n \log n)$, as claimed. \square

This lemma and the kernel on $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ points together imply an oracle communication protocol for POINT LINE COVER that matches the lower bound from Theorem 4 up to $k^{o(1)}$ factors. This suggests that a kernelization or compression to bit size $\mathcal{O}(k^{2+o(1)})$ may be possible; at least it is impossible to get better lower bounds via oracle communication protocols.

Corollary 1. *The POINT LINE COVER problem has an oracle communication protocol of cost $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log k)$ for deciding instances (\mathcal{P}, k) .*

Now, using the protocol from Lemma 7 in place of an efficient encoding, it is straightforward to complete the claimed lower bound of $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$ on the number of points in a kernel.

Proof of Theorem 1. By Lemma 7, such a kernelization would directly give an oracle communication protocol for POINT LINE COVER of cost $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon'})$: Given an instance (\mathcal{P}, k) , Alice applies the (polynomial-time) kernelization that generates an equivalent instance with $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$ points. Then she proceeds by using the protocol from the proof of Lemma 7.

As we already showed in Theorem 4, there is no $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon'})$ protocol for POINT LINE COVER for any $\varepsilon' > 0$, unless $\text{coNP} \subseteq \text{NP/poly}$. This completes the proof. \square

6 Conclusion

We took up the question of whether the known simple reduction of POINT LINE COVER instances (\mathcal{P}, k) to equivalent instances with k^2 points can be significantly improved. This has been posed as an open problem by Lokshtanov in his PhD Thesis [25] and also at the open problem sessions of various meetings of the Parameterized Algorithms community. Our main result, Theorem 1, answers Lokshtanov’s question in the negative.

Along the way, we proved that no polynomial-time reduction to size $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$ bits is possible either. Now, starting with the reduction to k^2 points, one can encode the order type of the reduced instance using *lambda matrices* [14] into $\mathcal{O}(k^4 \log k)$ bits. Let us recall however, that our lower bound (like all lower bounds via the same framework [8]) holds also for oracle communication protocols. Since we devise a protocol of cost $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log k)$, our lower bound seems to be the best possible with these methods. We pose as an open problem whether the gap between the upper and lower bound in the total size of a reduced instance can be closed; we expect that the “correct bound” is $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k^2)$ bits.

We briefly mention a variant of the SET COVER problem where sets are restricted to have pairwise intersections of cardinality at most one (1-ISC) [22], of which POINT LINE COVER is a special case. It is not hard to see that the reduction to k^2 points carries over directly to a reduction of the ground set of such a 1-ISC instance to k^2 elements if we are looking for a set cover of size most k . This also gives a polynomial kernelization of the problem of size $\mathcal{O}(k^5 \log k)$ bits since there are at most $\binom{k^2}{2}$ sets (each pair of ground set elements is in at most one of them), each containing at most k elements whose identity can be encoded in $\mathcal{O}(\log k)$ bits. (A more careful analysis yields an upper bound of $\mathcal{O}(k^4 \log k)$ bits.) The lower bound for the cost of oracle communication protocols for PLC carries over to this problem as well, and so 1-ISC has no such protocol or kernelization of cost/size $\mathcal{O}(k^{2-\varepsilon})$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ unless $\text{coNP} \subseteq \text{NP/poly}$. However, we do *not* know of a protocol for deciding 1-ISC instances with ground set of n elements at cost $\mathcal{O}(n^{1+o(1)})$, and so we do not have a bound for the size of the ground set. Thus, unlike for PLC, we also have no protocol of cost $\mathcal{O}(k^2 \log k)$ for 1-ISC to (essentially) match the lower bound for protocols. Note that the lower bound on the number of points does not transfer from PLC to (the ground set size of) 1-ISC since using a reduction for 1-ISC on a PLC instance does not necessarily result in a PLC instance. We ask whether the gap between upper and lower bounds for kernels for 1-ISC can be closed, and whether, perhaps similar to our protocol for PLC, a tight lower bound for the ground set elements can be proven.

References

- [1] Faisal N. Abu-Khzam. A kernelization algorithm for d-hitting set. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 76(7):524–531, 2010.
- [2] Hans L. Bodlaender, Rodney G. Downey, Michael R. Fellows, and Danny Hermelin. On problems without polynomial kernels. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 75(8):423–434, 2009.
- [3] Björn Brodén, Mikael Hammar, and Bengt J. Nilsson. Guarding lines and 2-link polygons is APX-hard. In *Proceedings of the 13th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, August 13-15, 2001*, pages 45–48, 2001.
- [4] Jianer Chen, Iyad A. Kanj, and Weijia Jia. Vertex cover: Further observations and further improvements. *J. Algorithms*, 41(2):280–301, 2001.
- [5] Marek Cygan, Fabrizio Grandoni, and Danny Hermelin. Tight kernel bounds for problems on graphs with small degeneracy. *CoRR*, abs/1305.4914, 2013.
- [6] Mark de Berg, Otfried Cheong, Marc van Kreveld, and Mark Overmars. *Computational Geometry*. Springer-Verlag, 3rd revised edition, 2008.
- [7] Holger Dell and Dániel Marx. Kernelization of packing problems. In Rabani [29], pages 68–81.
- [8] Holger Dell and Dieter van Melkebeek. Satisfiability Allows No Nontrivial Sparsification Unless The Polynomial-Time Hierarchy Collapses. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2010, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, 5-8 June 2010*, pages 251–260. ACM, 2010.
- [9] Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory*. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, Third edition, 2005.
- [10] Rod G. Downey and Michael R. Fellows. *Parameterized Complexity*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.
- [11] Vladimir Estivill-Castro, Apichat Heednacram, and Francis Suraweera. Reduction rules deliver efficient fpt-algorithms for covering points with lines. *ACM Journal of Experimental Algorithmics*, 14, 2009.
- [12] Jörg Flum and Martin Grohe. *Parameterized Complexity Theory*. Springer-Verlag, 2006.
- [13] Lance Fortnow and Rahul Santhanam. Infeasibility of instance compression and succinct PCPs for NP. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 77(1):91–106, 2011.
- [14] Jacob E. Goodman and Richard Pollack. The complexity of point configurations. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 31:167–180, 1991.
- [15] Jacob E. Goodman, Richard Pollack, and Bernd Sturmfels. Coordinate representation of order types requires exponential storage. In David S. Johnson, editor, *STOC*, pages 405–410. ACM, 1989.
- [16] Magdalene Grantson and Christos Levcopoulos. Covering a set of points with a minimum number of lines. In Tiziana Calamoneri, Irene Finocchi, and Giuseppe F. Italiano, editors, *Algorithms and Complexity, 6th Italian Conference, CIAC 2006, Rome, Italy, May 29-31, 2006, Proceedings*, volume 3998 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 6–17. Springer, 2006.
- [17] D. Yu. Grigor’ev and N.N. Vorobjov Jr. Solving systems of polynomial inequalities in subexponential time. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 5(12):37 – 64, 1988.
- [18] Refael Hassin and Nimrod Megiddo. Approximation algorithms for hitting objects with straight lines. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 20:29–42, 1991.
- [19] Apichat Heednacram. *The NP-Hardness of Covering Points with Lines, Paths and Tours and their Tractability with FPT-Algorithms*. Phd thesis, Griffith University, Australia, 2010.
- [20] Danny Hermelin and Xi Wu. Weak compositions and their applications to polynomial lower bounds for kernelization. In Rabani [29], pages 104–113.
- [21] Richard M. Karp. Reducibility Among Combinatorial Problems. In *Proceedings of a symposium on the Complexity of Computer Computations, held March 20-22, 1972, at the IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, New York*, The IBM Research Symposia Series, pages 85–103. Plenum Press, New York, 1972.
- [22] V. S. Anil Kumar, Sunil Arya, and H. Ramesh. Hardness of set cover with intersection 1. In Ugo Montanari, José D. P. Rolim, and Emo Welzl, editors, *Automata, Languages and Programming, 27th International Colloquium, ICALP 2000, Geneva, Switzerland, July 9-15, 2000, Proceedings*, volume

- 1853 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 624–635. Springer, 2000.
- [23] Michael Lampis. A kernel of order $2k - c \log k$ for vertex cover. *Information Processing Letters*, 111(23-24):1089–1091, 2011.
- [24] Stefan Langerman and Pat Morin. Covering things with things. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 33(4):717–729, 2005.
- [25] Daniel Lokshtanov. *New Methods in Parameterized Algorithms and Complexity*. PhD thesis, University of Bergen, Norway, 2009.
- [26] Daniel Lokshtanov, Neeldhara Misra, and Saket Saurabh. Kernelization - preprocessing with a guarantee. In Hans L. Bodlaender, Rod Downey, Fedor V. Fomin, and Dániel Marx, editors, *The Multivariate Algorithmic Revolution and Beyond*, volume 7370 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 129–161. Springer, 2012.
- [27] Nimrod Megiddo and Arie Tamir. On the Complexity of Locating Linear Facilities in the Plane. *Operations Research Letters*, 1(5):194–197, 1982.
- [28] Rolf Niedermeier. *Invitation to Fixed-Parameter Algorithms*. Oxford University Press, 2006.
- [29] Yuval Rabani, editor. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2012, Kyoto, Japan, January 17-19, 2012*. SIAM, 2012.
- [30] Jianxin Wang, Wenjun Li, and Jianer Chen. A parameterized algorithm for the hyperplane-cover problem. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 411(44-46):4005–4009, 2010.
- [31] Chee-Keng Yap. Some consequences of non-uniform conditions on uniform classes. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 26:287–300, 1983.