

The Continuous 1.5D Terrain Guarding Problem: Discretization, Optimal Solutions, and PTAS*

Stephan Friedrichs,[†] Michael Hemmer,[‡] and Christiane Schmidt[§]

Abstract

In the NP-hard [30] continuous 1.5D Terrain Guarding Problem (TGP) we are given an x -monotone chain of line segments in \mathbb{R}^2 (the *terrain* T), and ask for the minimum number of guards (located anywhere on T) required to guard all of T . We construct guard candidate and witness sets $G, W \subset T$ of polynomial size, such that any feasible (optimal) guard cover $G^* \subseteq G$ for W is also feasible (optimal) for the continuous TGP. This discretization allows us to: (1) settle NP-completeness for the continuous TGP; (2) provide a Polynomial Time Approximation Scheme (PTAS) for the continuous TGP using the existing PTAS for the discrete TGP by Gibson et al. [22]; (3) formulate the continuous TGP as an Integer Linear Program (IP). Furthermore, we propose several filtering techniques reducing the size of our discretization, allowing us to devise an efficient IP-based algorithm that reliably provides optimal guard placements for terrains with up to 10^6 vertices within minutes on a standard desktop computer.

1 Introduction

In the 1.5D Terrain Guarding Problem (TGP), we are given an x -monotone chain of line segments in \mathbb{R}^2 , on which we have to place a minimum number of point-shaped guards, such that they cover the entire terrain. This—admittedly theoretical—problem is a close relative of the Art Gallery Problem (AGP) and traditionally motivated by the optimal placement of antennas for line-of-sight communication networks, or the placement of street lights or security cameras along roads [1].

The authors would like to revive a motivation stemming from their AGP background [10, 15, 16, 31] that was already mentioned in [1]: A natural application for the AGP is the placement of sensors or communication devices w.r.t. obstacles, for example placing laser scanners in production facilities in order to acquire a precise mapping of the facility [31]. While the AGP properly models most indoor environments, it cannot capture many outdoor scenarios like placing cell phone towers in an urban environment, because it does not take height information into account. To remedy this shortcoming essentially means working on

*This work extends and subsumes the extended abstracts that appeared in the *Proceedings of the 26th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry (CCCG 2014)*, pages 367–373, 2014 [18], and in the *31st European Workshop on Computational Geometry (EuroCG 2015)*, pages 212–215, 2015 [19].

[†]Max Planck Institute for Informatics, Saarbrücken, Germany, sfriedri@mpi-inf.mpg.de

[‡]TU Braunschweig, IBR, Algorithms Group, Braunschweig, Germany, mhsaar@gmail.com

[§]Communications and Transport Systems, ITN, Linköping University, Sweden. Supported by grant 2014-03476 from Sweden’s innovation agency VINNOVA. christiane.schmidt@liu.se

two dimensions and height, a 2.5D AGP. In order to develop techniques useful for dealing with height information in a geometric covering problem, we first examine one dimension and height, the 1.5D TGP. We show in this paper that the “height dimension” is much more benevolent than the “second dimension” in the AGP: It allows a finite discretization, whose existence in the AGP is, to the best of our knowledge, still unknown, and poses one of the key challenges w.r.t. software solving the AGP [10]. We hope that our contribution helps tackling the 2.5D AGP.

1.1 Our Contribution

1. Our core contribution is to show that the Continuous Terrain Guarding Problem (CTGP), where guards can be freely placed on the terrain, has a polynomial-size discretization (Section 2). We then infer two results:
 - (a) While the CTGP is known to be NP-hard [30], we also conclude that it is a member of NP, and hence NP-complete (Section 3).
 - (b) It follows from the Polynomial Time Approximation Scheme (PTAS) for the discrete TGP from Gibson et al. [22] that there is a PTAS for the CTGP (Section 4).
2. We present several filtering techniques reducing the size of our discretization (Section 5). These are of theoretical interest as well as a key ingredient of our implementation.
3. Discretization and filtering techniques allow us to formulate the CTGP as Integer Linear Program (IP). We present an efficient algorithm which is able to find optimal solutions for instances with up to 10^6 vertices of the CTGP as well as the Terrain Guarding Problem with Vertex Guards (VTGP) within minutes¹ on a standard desktop computer.² We thoroughly test our algorithm and the effect of each filtering technique (Sections 6 and 7).

1.2 Related Work

The TGP is closely related to the well known and studied AGP where given a polygon P , we seek a minimum cardinality guard set that completely covers P . Potential guards can, e.g., be located on the vertices only (*vertex guards*), on arbitrary points in P (*point guards*), or patrol along edges (*edge guards*) or diagonals (*diagonal guards*) of P . Many polygon classes have been considered for the AGP, including simple polygons, polygons with holes, and orthogonal polygons (where all edges are axis-aligned). Moreover, the guards’ task can be altered, e.g. Laurentini [32] required visibility coverage only for the edges of P , but not for the interior.

The first result in the context of the AGP was obtained by Chvátal [5], who proved the *Art Gallery Theorem*, answering a question posed by Victor Klee in 1973 (see [34]): $\lfloor \frac{n}{3} \rfloor$ guards are always sufficient and sometimes necessary to guard a polygon of n vertices. A simple and elegant proof of the sufficiency was later given by Fisk [17]. Related results were

¹Less than 10 minutes on a single core.

²Standard as of 2015: An Intel Core i7-3770 CPU with 3.4 GHz with 14 GB of main memory.

obtained for various polygon classes, Kahn et al. [26] established a tight bound of $\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor$ for orthogonal polygons with n vertices.

The work of Chvátal and its variants focused on upper bounds on the number of guards sufficient for all polygons in a specific class. However, the AGP also is an optimization problem (given a polygon, find the minimum number of guards needed to cover it), and it was shown to be NP-hard for various problem versions [35, 37], even the allegedly easier problem of finding a minimum cardinality vertex guard set in simple polygons is NP-hard as established by Lee and Lin [33]. Eidenbenz et al. [13] gave bounds on the approximation ratio: For polygons with holes a lower bound of $\Omega(\log n)$ holds, for vertex, edge and point guards in simple polygons they showed the problem to be APX-hard.

In search of optimal guard set for specific polygons, Chwa et al. [6] considered witnessable polygons, in which a finite set of witness points exists, such that coverage of these witnesses guarantees complete coverage of the polygon. For detailed surveys on the AGP see O’Rourke [34] and Shermer [38] for classical results, and de Rezende et al. [10] for more recent computational developments.

Motivation for terrain guarding is traditionally given by the placement of street lights or security cameras along roads, or the optimal placement of antennas for line-of-sight communication networks [1]. For the TGP, research first focused on approximation algorithms, because NP-hardness was generally assumed, but had not been established. The first constant-factor approximation was given by Ben-Moshe et al. [1]. They presented a combinatorial constant-factor approximation for the discrete vertex guard problem version $\text{TGP}(V, V)$,³ where only vertex guards are used to cover only the vertices, and were able to use it as a building block for an $O(1)$ -approximation of $\text{TGP}(T, T)$, where guards on arbitrary locations on T must guard all of T . The approximation factor of this algorithm was never stated by the authors, but was claimed to be 6 in [29] (with minor modifications).

Another constant-factor approximation based on ϵ -nets and Set Cover (SC) was given by Clarkson and Varadarajan [7]. King [29] presented a 4-approximation (which was later shown to actually be a 5-approximation [28]), both for the discrete $\text{TGP}(V, V)$ and the continuous $\text{TGP}(T, T)$ problem. The most recent $O(1)$ -approximation was presented by Elbassioni et al. [14]: For non-overlapping discrete subsets of the terrain T as guard candidates and witnesses ($G, W \subset T$) LP-rounding techniques lead to a 4-approximation (5-approximation if $G \cap W \neq \emptyset$) for $\text{TGP}(G, W)$ as well as for the continuous case ($\text{TGP}(T, T)$). This approximation is also applicable for the more general weighted TGP: Weights are assigned to the guards and a minimum weight guard set is to be identified.

Finally, in the 2009 conference version of [22], Gibson et al. showed that the discrete TGP allows a PTAS based on local search. They present PTAS’s for two problem variants: for two (not necessarily disjoint) finite subsets of the terrain T of guard candidates G and witnesses W ($\text{TGP}(G, W)$) and for the variant with a finite guard candidate set G that covers the complete terrain ($\text{TGP}(G, T)$). For the continuous case, i.e., $\text{TGP}(T, T)$, they claim that the local search works as well, but that they were not yet able to limit the number of bits needed to represent the guards maintained by the local search. Thus, to the best of our knowledge, no PTAS for $\text{TGP}(T, T)$ has been established until now.

Only after all these approximation results the TGP was shown to be an NP-hard prob-

³With $\text{TGP}(G, W)$ we refer to the version of the TGP where guards have to be placed on points in G such that they guard all points in W , compare Definition 1.1.




Figure 1: The visibility region $\mathcal{V}(p)$ of $p \in T$ (blue) consists of $O(n)$ subterrains.

lem. King and Krohn [30] proved both the discrete and the continuous case to be NP-hard by a reduction from PLANAR 3SAT in 2010 (the conference version of [30] appeared in 2010). Whether the CTGP is a member of NP remained, to the best of our knowledge, an open problem. We answer this question positively in Section 3.

Problem variants of the TGP include, for example, guards that are allowed to “hover” over the terrain (Eidenbenz [12]), guarding vertices of an orthogonal terrain (Katz and Roisman [27]), or, recently, guarding the vertices of an orthogonal terrain under directed visibility (Durocher et al. [11]).

Not only the TGP has been considered for 1.5D terrains: Hurtado et al. [25] gave a sweep line algorithm for the computation of visibility regions, i.e., the set of points on the terrain visible to a point p on the terrain. Haas and Hemmer [24] presented an implementation for an extended version of this algorithm as well as a very fast variant incorporating ideas of the Triangular Expansion Algorithm for visibility computations in polygons by Bungiu et al. [3]. Our implementation uses that of Haas and Hemmer [24].

1.3 Preliminaries and Notation

A *terrain* T is an x -monotone chain of line segments in \mathbb{R}^2 defined by its *vertices* $V(T) = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ that has *edges* $E(T) = \{e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}\}$ with $e_i = \overline{v_i v_{i+1}}$. Unless specified otherwise, $n := |V(T)|$. Where T is clear from context, we occasionally abbreviate $V(T)$ and $E(T)$ by V and E , respectively. v_i and v_{i+1} are the vertices of the edge e_i , and $\text{int}(e_i) := e_i \setminus \{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ is its *interior*. Due to monotonicity the points on T are totally ordered w.r.t. their x -coordinates. For $p, q \in T$, we write $p \leq q$ ($p < q$) if p is (strictly) left of q , i.e., if p has a (strictly) smaller x -coordinate than q . We refer to a closed, connected subset of T as a *subterrain*.

A point $p \in T$ *sees* or *covers* $q \in T$ if and only if \overline{pq} is nowhere below T . $\mathcal{V}(p)$ is the *visibility region* of p with $\mathcal{V}(p) := \{q \in T \mid p \text{ sees } q\}$. Observe that $\mathcal{V}(p)$ is not necessarily connected, and is the union of $O(n)$ subterrains, compare Figure 1. We say that $q \in \mathcal{V}(p)$ is *extremal* in $\mathcal{V}(p)$, if q has a maximal or minimal x -coordinate within its subterrain in $\mathcal{V}(p)$. For $G \subseteq T$ we abbreviate $\mathcal{V}(G) := \bigcup_{g \in G} \mathcal{V}(g)$. A set $G \subseteq T$ with $\mathcal{V}(G) = T$ is named a (*guard*) *cover* of T . In this context, $g \in G$ is sometimes referred to as *guard*.

Definition 1.1 (Terrain Guarding Problem). *In the Terrain Guarding Problem (TGP),*

abbreviated $\text{TGP}(G, W)$, we are given a terrain T and sets of guard candidates and witnesses $G, W \subseteq T$. C is feasible w.r.t. $\text{TGP}(G, W)$ if and only if $C \subseteq G$ and $W \subseteq \mathcal{V}(C)$. If C is feasible and $|C| = \text{OPT}(G, W) := \min\{|C| \mid C \text{ is feasible w.r.t. } \text{TGP}(G, W)\}$, we say that C is optimal w.r.t. $\text{TGP}(G, W)$. $\text{TGP}(G, W)$ asks for an optimal guard cover $C \subseteq G$.

Throughout this paper, we assume $W \subseteq \mathcal{V}(G)$, i.e., that $\text{TGP}(G, W)$ has a feasible solution. The *Continuous Terrain Guarding Problem (CTGP)* is $\text{TGP}(T, T)$, i.e., the version of TGP that seeks to guard the entire terrain and imposes no restrictions on where on T guards may be placed. The CTGP is the primary focus of this paper. A well-established version is the *Terrain Guarding Problem with Vertex Guards (VTGP)*, $\text{TGP}(V(T), T)$, where we seek to guard all of T , but the guard positions are restricted to the vertices. We consider it a representative of the numerous discrete versions of the TGP; our algorithm solves both, CTGP and VTGP, and generalizes to arbitrary discretizations.

2 Discretization

This section is our core contribution. We consider the following problem: Given a terrain T with n vertices, construct sets $G, W \subset T$ (guard candidate and witness points) of size polynomial in n , such that any feasible (optimal) solution for $\text{TGP}(G, W)$ is feasible (optimal) for $\text{TGP}(T, T)$ as well. We proceed in three steps.

1. In Section 2.1 we assume that we are provided with some finite guard candidate set $G \subset T$. We show how to construct a witness set $W(G)$ with $|W(G)| \in O(n|G|)$, such that any feasible solution of $\text{TGP}(G, W(G))$ is feasible for $\text{TGP}(G, T)$ as well.
2. Section 2.2 discusses a set of guard candidates U with $|U| \in O(n^2)$, containing all guard candidates required for minimum-cardinality coverage of T .
3. The last step is to combine the above results. In Section 2.3 we argue that optimal solutions for $\text{TGP}(T, T)$ can be obtained using $\text{TGP}(U, W(U))$. This shows membership of NP, yields a Polynomial Time Approximation Scheme (PTAS), and can be used to construct exact solutions (Sections 3, 4, and 6, respectively).

When discretizing a problem as closely related to the Art Gallery Problem (AGP) as the Terrain Guarding Problem (TGP), one should first consider the work of Chwa et al. who pursued the idea of *witnessable* polygons [6], which allow placing a finite set of witnesses, such that covering the witnesses with any guard set implies full coverage of the polygon. The basic building block of Chwa et al. is the notion of *visibility kernels*: Given some point w in a polygon, the visibility kernel of w is the kernel of its visibility polygon. Chwa et al. show that a polygon admits a finite witness set if and only if it can be covered by a finite set of visibility kernels. Sadly, this is not the case for general polygons.

Transferring this approach to the TGP means that the visibility kernel of $w \in T$ becomes $\text{VK}(w) := \{w' \in T \mid \mathcal{V}(w) \subseteq \mathcal{V}(w')\}$. Then for the terrain T and $w \in T$ in Figure 2 we have $\text{VK}(w) = \{w, w', w''\}$, so $\text{VK}(w)$ is finite. The same argument holds for infinitely many $\bar{w} \in T$ near w . Since no visibility kernel covers more than one such \bar{w} , T cannot be covered by finitely many visibility kernels. It follows that T does not admit a finite visibility kernel cover and thus is not witnessable as defined by Chwa et al. (note that we introduce a finite




Figure 2: Witness w , $\mathcal{V}(w)$ highlighted in red, and its finite visibility kernel $\text{VK}(w) = \{w, w', w''\}$ marked in blue. \bar{w} has equivalent properties.

set of witnesses below, but that it is different in that it is associated with a finite guard set). In conclusion, general terrains, like general polygons, are not witnessable.

2.1 Witnesses

Suppose we are given a terrain T and a finite set $G \subset T$ of guard candidates with $\mathcal{V}(G) = T$, and we want to cover T using only guards $C \subseteq G$, i.e., we want to solve $\text{TGP}(G, T)$. G could be the set $V(T)$ of vertices to solve the Terrain Guarding Problem with Vertex Guards (VTGP) or any other finite set, especially our guard candidates in Equation (5).

G is finite by assumption but T is not, so we construct a finite set $W(G) \subset T$ with polynomially many (in n and $|G|$) witness points, such that feasible solutions for $\text{TGP}(G, W(G))$ also is feasible for $\text{TGP}(G, T)$.

Let $g \in G$ be one of the guard candidates. $\mathcal{V}(g)$ subdivides T into $O(n)$ subterrains, compare Figure 1. Monotonicity of T allows us to project those subterrains onto the x -axis and thus to represent $\mathcal{V}(g)$ as a set of closed *visibility intervals*. We consider the overlay of all visibility intervals of all guard candidates in G , see Figure 3 for an overlay of three guard candidates. It forms a subdivision consisting of *maximal intervals* and *end points*. Every point in a *feature* f (either end point or maximal interval) of the subdivision is seen by the same set of guards

$$G(f) := \{g \in G \mid f \subseteq \mathcal{V}(g)\}. \quad (1)$$

Observation 2.1. *Let f be a feature of the guard candidates' overlay and let $g \in G$ be a guard. Now consider an arbitrary witness $w \in f$. Then*

$$w \in \mathcal{V}(g) \Leftrightarrow f \subseteq \mathcal{V}(g) \stackrel{(1)}{\Leftrightarrow} g \in G(f), \quad (2)$$

i.e., covering w and f are equivalent for guards in G , because every guard sees either nothing or all of f by construction.

Observation 2.2. *Let G be a finite set of guard candidates, and f a feature in the overlay of G . Then a witness point $w \in f$ can be represented by the set $G(f)$ of guards covering f . We occasionally interpret w as a set and write $g \in w$ for $g \in G(f)$.*




Figure 3: Visibility overlay of the guard candidates g_1 , g_2 , and g_3 . $\mathcal{V}(g_1)$, $\mathcal{V}(g_2)$, and $\mathcal{V}(g_3)$ are indicated in blue, orange, and green, respectively. Regions marked by altering colors are seen by multiple guard candidates.

It follows that placing one witness in every feature of the subdivision ensures that coverage of all these witnesses implies coverage of all features and thus of T . This requires $O(n|G|)$ witnesses. However, keeping efficient algorithms in mind, we reduce the number of witnesses, compare Section 5.3: Similar to the shadow atomic visibility polygons in [8], which is a successful strategy in AGP algorithms [10], it suffices to only include those features f with inclusion-minimal $G(f)$:

Theorem 2.3. *Consider a terrain T and a finite set of guard candidates G with $\mathcal{V}(G) = T$. Let F_G denote the set of features of the visibility overlay of G on T and $w_f \in f$ an arbitrary point in the feature $f \in F_G$. Then for*

$$W(G) := \{w_f \mid f \in F_G, G(f) \text{ is inclusion-minimal}\}, \quad (3)$$

we have that if $C \subseteq G$ is feasible w.r.t. $\text{TGP}(G, W(G))$, then C is also feasible w.r.t. $\text{TGP}(G, T)$, and

$$\text{OPT}(G, W(G)) = \text{OPT}(G, T). \quad (4)$$

Proof. Let $C \subseteq G$ cover $W(G)$ and consider some point $w \in T$. We show that $w \in \mathcal{V}(C)$. By assumption, $w \in \mathcal{V}(G)$ and thus $w \in f$ for some feature $f \in F_G$. $W(G)$ either contains some witness in $w_f \in f$ or a witness $w_{f'}$ with $G(f') \subseteq G(f)$ by construction. In the first case, w must be covered, otherwise w_f would not be covered and C would be infeasible for $\text{TGP}(G, W(G))$. In the second case $w_{f'}$ is covered, so some guard in $G(f')$ is part of C , and that guard also covers f and therefore w .

As for Equation (4), observe that $\text{TGP}(G, W(G))$ is a relaxation of $\text{TGP}(G, T)$, so $\text{OPT}(G, W(G)) \leq \text{OPT}(G, T)$ follows. Furthermore, if C is feasible and optimal w.r.t. $\text{TGP}(G, W(G))$, it is also feasible for $\text{TGP}(G, T)$ as argued above. It follows that $|C| = \text{OPT}(G, W(G)) \geq \text{OPT}(G, T)$, proving (4). \square




Figure 4: The set of inclusion-minimal features may still have cardinality $O(n|G|)$.

Observation 2.4. *Using the set of one witnesses per inclusion-minimal feature as in Equation (3) may not reduce the worst-case complexity of $|W(G)| \in O(n|G|)$ witnesses.*

Proof. Compare Figure 4. For $|G| \in \Theta(n)$ consider the terrain with $\Theta(n)$ valleys with $\frac{|G|}{3}$ guards placed on the left (blue) and the right (red) slope each. In addition there is one guard (black) placed in each valley. Thus, each of the $\Theta(n)$ valleys contains $\Theta(|G|)$ inclusion-minimal intervals depicted in violet, resulting in $O(n|G|)$ inclusion-minimal features. \square

Nevertheless, using only the inclusion-minimal witnesses does speed up our implementation significantly, compare Sections 5.3 and 7.4.6.

Observation 2.5. *$W(G)$ does not contain an end point p between two maximal intervals I_1 and I_2 : $G(p) = G(I_1) \cup G(I_2)$, since visibility regions are closed sets.*

2.2 Guards

Throughout this section, let T be a terrain, $V = V(T)$ its vertices and $E = E(T)$ its edges; let $C \subset T$ be feasible w.r.t. $\text{TGP}(T, T)$, i.e., some finite, possibly optimal, guard cover of T . We define U as the union of V with all x -extremal points of all visibility regions of all vertices:

$$U := V \cup \bigcup_{v \in V} \{p \mid p \text{ is extremal in } \mathcal{V}(v)\}. \quad (5)$$

In the remainder of this section we show that U contains all guard candidates necessary for solving the Continuous Terrain Guarding Problem (CTGP), $\text{TGP}(T, T)$. Formally, we show that $\text{OPT}(U, T) = \text{OPT}(T, T)$.

Observation 2.6. *U has cardinality $O(n^2)$, as noted by Ben-Moshe et al. [1]: n vertices with visibility regions of $O(n)$ subterrains each.*

Ben-Moshe et al. use a similar set, but they also add an arbitrary point of T between each pair of consecutive points in U . They need these points as witnesses. We, however, keep the witnesses separate by our definition of $\text{TGP}(G, W)$.




Figure 5: The edge e is critical w.r.t. g_ℓ and g_r : The right (left) part of e_i , indicated in blue (red), is seen by g_ℓ (g_r) only.

Our strategy is to show that in any cover C of T it is always possible to move a guard in $C \setminus U$ to a carefully chosen point in U without losing coverage. This procedure preserves cardinality and feasibility of any feasible cover, and iterating it results in a cover $C \subseteq U$. In particular, this is possible for an optimal guard cover.

First observe that losing coverage of an edge $e \in E$ that is entirely covered by a guard $g \in C \setminus U$ by moving g to one of its neighbors in U is impossible.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $g \in C \setminus U$ be a guard that covers an entire edge $e_i \in E$. Then u_ℓ, u_r , the U -neighbors of g with*

$$u_\ell = \max\{u \in U \mid u < g\} \quad (6)$$

$$u_r = \min\{u \in U \mid g < u\} \quad (7)$$

each entirely cover e_i , too.

Proof. g covers e_i , so $v_i, v_{i+1} \in \mathcal{V}(g)$, implying $g \in \mathcal{V}(v_i) \cap \mathcal{V}(v_{i+1})$. Moving g towards u_ℓ does not move g out of $\mathcal{V}(v_i)$ or $\mathcal{V}(v_{i+1})$, as the boundaries of those regions are contained in U by construction. Hence, $v_i, v_{i+1} \in \mathcal{V}(u_\ell)$ and thus $e_i \subseteq \mathcal{V}(u_\ell)$. Analogously, we have $e_i \subseteq \mathcal{V}(u_r)$. \square

It remains to consider the edges not entirely covered by a single guard, compare Figure 5. We refer to such edges as *critical edges*:

Definition 2.8 (Critical Edge). *$e \in E$ is a critical edge w.r.t. g in the cover C if $C \setminus \{g\}$ covers some part of, but not all of, $\text{int}(e)$. We call e a critical edge, if it is a critical edge w.r.t. some $g \in C$.*

Observe that e being critical w.r.t. $g \in C$ is equivalent to more than one guard being responsible for covering its interior.

Definition 2.9 (Left-Guard/Right-Guard). *$g \in C$ is a left-guard (right-guard) of $e_i \in E$ if $g < v_i$ ($v_{i+1} < g$) and e_i is critical w.r.t. g . We call g left-guard (right-guard) if it is a left-guard (right-guard) of some $e \in E$.*

For the sake of completeness, we state and prove the following lemma, which also follows from the well-established order claim [1]:

Lemma 2.10. *Let $g \in C$ be a guard left of v_i (right of v_{i+1}) such that g covers a non-empty subset of $\text{int}(e_i)$. Then g covers a single interval of e_i , including v_{i+1} (v_i). In particular, this holds if g is a left-guard (right-guard) of e_i .*

Proof. Refer to Figure 5. Obviously, $g = g_\ell$ is nowhere below the line supporting e_i . Let p be a point on e_i seen by g_ℓ . It follows that $\overline{g_\ell p}$ and $\overline{p v_{i+1}}$ form an x -monotone convex chain that is nowhere below T . Thus, the $\overline{g_\ell v_{i+1}}$ is nowhere below T . It follows that g_ℓ sees v_{i+1} and any point on $\overline{p v_{i+1}}$. A symmetric argument holds for the right-guard g_r . \square

Corollary 2.11. *For each critical edge e there is exactly one left-guard, as well as exactly one right-guard in C .*

Proof. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $g, g' \in C$ both are critical left-guards of e . By Lemma 2.10, $I := \mathcal{V}(g) \cap e$ and $I' := \mathcal{V}(g') \cap e$ are single intervals on e . Assume w.l.o.g. that $I' \subseteq I$. This contradicts g' being a left-guard of e , because g dominates g' on e , and thus $e \subseteq \mathcal{V}(C \setminus \{g'\})$. So e has exactly one critical left-guard and a symmetric argument shows that e has exactly one right-guard. \square

Corollary 2.12. *Let $e \in E$ be a critical edge and $g_\ell, g_r \in C$ be its left- and right-guards. Then $\mathcal{V}(g_\ell) \cap e \cap \mathcal{V}(g_r) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. For the sake of contradiction, suppose $I := e \setminus (\mathcal{V}(g_\ell) \cup \mathcal{V}(g_r)) \neq \emptyset$ and refer to Figure 5. Since C is feasible I is covered, so some $g \in C$ sees a point $p \in I$. By Lemma 2.10, g sees a continuous interval containing p and w.l.o.g. the right vertex of e . It follows that g dominates g_ℓ on e , contradicting that g_ℓ is a critical left-guard of e . \square

We know from Lemma 2.7 that we can move a non-critical guard $g \in C$, i.e., one that is only responsible for entire edges, to one of its neighbors in U without losing coverage of T . This works because U contains a candidate point at every location, where one vertex's visibility region ends, so not moving across these candidate points implies still seeing all the vertices (and thus edges). Unfortunately, the same thing is not possible if g is left- or right-guard: We might lose coverage of some part of an edge that is critical w.r.t. g . However, the following lemma gives us some leverage: It shows that we can move a guard $g \in C \setminus U$ to its left neighbor vertex without losing coverage of T if g is not a right-guard (a symmetric version for a non-left-guard follows).

Lemma 2.13. *Let C be some finite cover of T , let $g \in C \setminus V$ be a left- but no right-guard, and let $v_\ell = \max\{v \in V \mid v < g\}$ be the rightmost vertex left of g . Then*

$$C' = (C \setminus \{g\}) \cup \{v_\ell\} \tag{8}$$

is a guard cover of T .

Proof. Since g is a left-guard of some critical edge e_r , there must exist a corresponding right-guard g_r of e_r , compare Figure 6. Let $p_\ell \in \{p \in \mathcal{V}(g) \mid p \leq g\}$ be a point that g sees to its left. We show that p_ℓ is seen by g_r : Consider p_r , a point in $\mathcal{V}(g) \cap e_r \cap \mathcal{V}(g_r)$, which exists by Corollary 2.12. $\overline{p_\ell g}$, $\overline{g p_r}$, and $\overline{p_r g_r}$ form a convex chain (convex because $g \notin V$ by assumption and $p_r \notin V$ by construction) that is nowhere below T , so $p \in \mathcal{V}(g_r)$. Thus, g is dominated to its left by g_r .




Figure 6: No guard $g \in C$ is both left- and right-guard. Any point on the critical edge e_ℓ seen by g is also seen by the guard g_r , the critical right-guard w.r.t. e_r . Hence, e_ℓ can not be critical w.r.t. to g , contradiction




Figure 7: Moving the left-guard g to the left. Any point p that g sees to its right remains visible while moving g towards its closest vertex v_ℓ to the left.

Moreover, g is dominated to its right by v_ℓ , see Figure 7: Let $p \in \{p \in \mathcal{V}(g) \mid g \leq p\}$ be a point seen by g , which is located to the right of g . Then $\overline{v_\ell g}$ and \overline{gp} form a convex chain nowhere below T , so $p \in \mathcal{V}(v_\ell)$.

In conclusion, replacing g by v_ℓ in C yields a feasible cover because $\{p \in \mathcal{V}(g) \mid p \leq g\}$ is covered by g_r and $\{p \in \mathcal{V}(g) \mid g \leq p\}$ by the new guard position v_ℓ . \square

Corollary 2.14. *Let C be some finite cover of T , let $g \in C \setminus V$ be a right- but no left-guard, and let $v_r = \min\{v \in V \mid g < v\}$ be the leftmost vertex right of g . Then*

$$C' = (C \setminus \{g\}) \cup \{v_r\} \tag{9}$$

is a guard cover of T .

So far, the status is that guards in $C \setminus V$ that are neither left- nor right-guard can be moved to a U -neighbor. Left-guards (right-guards) that are no right-guard (left-guard) can even be moved to the next vertex to the left (right). The only case to be dealt with is a guard g that is both a left- and right-guard. This would indeed be a nasty scenario, since none of the above lemmas allows us to move g . Fortunately, Lemma 2.15 saves the day:

Lemma 2.15. *Let C be some finite cover of T . No $g \in C \setminus V$ is both a left- and a right-guard.*

Proof. Refer to Figure 6. We prove the claim by contradiction. Suppose that $g \in C \setminus V$ is the left-guard of some edge e_r (to the right of g) and the right-guard for some e_ℓ (to the

left of g). Since e_r is critical, there must also be a right-guard g_r of e_r . By Corollary 2.12 there is at least one point $p_r \in e_r$ that is seen by g and g_r . As $g \in C \setminus V$, $g \in \text{int}(e)$ for some edge e .

Now consider p_r and any point $p_\ell \in \mathcal{V}(g)$, such that $p_\ell < g$. Both points are not below the line supported by e and the same holds for g and g_r with respect to e_r . It follows that segments $\overline{p_\ell g}$, $\overline{g p_r}$, and $\overline{p_r g_r}$ form an x -monotone convex chain that is nowhere below T . Hence, g_r sees p_ℓ . It follows that $\overline{p_\ell g_r}$ is not below T , i.e., g_r sees p_ℓ .

Thus, any point $p \in \mathcal{V}(g)$ to the left of g is also seen by g_r , a contradiction to g being a right-guard. \square

The next theorem connects the dots and shows that the set U as defined in Equation (5) contains all guard candidates necessary for a minimum-cardinality guard cover of T . So even if we are allowed to place guards anywhere on T , we only need the candidate points in U and thus have discretized the CTGP.

Theorem 2.16. *Let T be a terrain, and consider U from Equation (5). Then we have*

$$\text{OPT}(U, T) = \text{OPT}(T, T). \quad (10)$$

Proof. Let C be feasible and optimal w.r.t. $\text{TGP}(T, T)$. We show how to replace a guard $g \in C \setminus U$ by one in U , without violating $\mathcal{V}(C) = T$. Iterating this until $C \subseteq U$ maintains the cardinality of C , thus proving the claim.

Should g be neither left- nor right-guard, it is, by definition, only responsible for entire edges. Thus it can be moved to a neighboring point in U by Lemma 2.7. If, on the other hand, g is only a left-, but not a right-guard (or vice versa), it can be moved to its left (right) neighbor in $V \subseteq U$ as shown in Lemma 2.13 (Corollary 2.14). Lemma 2.15 asserts that the only remaining case, i.e., that g is a left- and a right-guard at the same time, does not occur. \square

2.3 Full Discretization

We formulate the key result of this section: The CTGP, i.e., finding a minimum-cardinality guard cover C guarding an entire terrain T , without any restriction on where on T the guards can be placed, is a discrete problem. Furthermore, our discretization $(U, W(U))$ is of size polynomial in n .

Theorem 2.17. *Let T be a terrain, and consider U and $W(U)$ as defined in Equations (5) and (3). Then if $C \subseteq U$ is optimal and feasible w.r.t $\text{TGP}(U, W(U))$, i.e., if $\mathcal{V}(C) = T$ and $|C| = \text{OPT}(U, W(U))$, it follows that C is also an optimal solution of $\text{TGP}(T, T)$:*

$$\text{OPT}(T, T) = \text{OPT}(U, W(U)). \quad (11)$$

Proof.

$$\text{OPT}(T, T) \stackrel{(10)}{=} \text{OPT}(U, T) \stackrel{(4)}{=} \text{OPT}(U, W(U)). \quad (12)$$

\square

Observation 2.18. *Observations 2.4 and 2.6 yield: The set of guard candidates U and the witness set $W(U)$ have cardinality $O(n^2)$ and $O(n^3)$, respectively.*

Observation 2.19. *Let B be the largest number of bits that are required to represent a coordinate of V . The number of bits required to represent the coordinates of a guard candidate $g \in U$ is polynomial in B as the coordinates of g are defined by the intersection of two lines each defined by two vertices in V .*

3 Complexity Results

For a long time NP-hardness of the Continuous Terrain Guarding Problem (CTGP) was generally assumed, but not shown until 2010 by King and Krohn (in the conference version of [30]). In this section we establish that the CTGP is also a member of NP, and thus NP-complete. This is surprising, as it is a long-standing open problem for the more general Art Gallery Problem (AGP): For the AGP it is not known whether the coordinates of an optimal guard cover can be represented with a polynomial number of bits. This, however, we answer for the CTGP in Theorem 2.17 and Observation 2.19: There exists a guard candidate set with coordinates of polynomial size that can host an optimal solution.

Theorem 3.1. *The Continuous Terrain Guarding Problem (CTGP) is NP-complete: Given a terrain T with rational vertices $V(T) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^2$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it is NP-complete to decide whether there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ guards $G = \{g_1, \dots, g_k\} \subseteq T$ with $\mathcal{V}(G) = T$.*

Proof. NP-hardness of the CTGP is established in [30], it remains to show that CTGP is in NP: A non-deterministic Turing machine determines U (possible in polynomial time, compare Observation 2.19) and guesses k guards. It then verifies in polynomial time [25] whether this guard set covers T . \square

4 Polynomial Time Approximation Scheme

In this section we combine our discretization from Section 2 with the Polynomial Time Approximation Scheme (PTAS) for discrete TGP(G, W) with finite $G, W \subset T$ by Gibson et al. [22], who established the following theorem:

Theorem 4.1 (PTAS by Gibson et al. [22]). *Let T be a terrain, and let $G, W \subset T$ be finite sets of guard candidates and witnesses such that $W \subseteq \mathcal{V}(G)$. Then there exists a PTAS for TGP(G, W). That is, for every constant $\epsilon > 0$, there is an algorithm that returns $C \subseteq G$ with $W \subseteq \mathcal{V}(C)$, such that*

$$|C| \leq (1 + \epsilon) \text{OPT}(G, W). \quad (13)$$

We combine our discretization from Theorem 2.17 with Theorem 4.1:

Theorem 4.2. *Let T be a terrain. Then there exists a PTAS for the Continuous Terrain Guarding Problem (CTGP), TGP(T, T). That is, for any constant $\epsilon > 0$, there is a polynomial time algorithm which returns $C \subseteq T$ with $\mathcal{V}(C) = T$ and $|C| \leq (1 + \epsilon) \text{OPT}(T, T)$.*

Proof. Using Equations (5) and (3) we determine the sets U and $W(U)$ for T with $|U| + |W(U)| \in O(n^3)$ by Observation 2.18. Given $\epsilon > 0$, by Theorem 4.1, we can compute $C \subseteq U \subset T$ such that

$$|C| \stackrel{(13)}{\leq} (1 + \epsilon) \text{OPT}(U, W(U)) \stackrel{(11)}{=} (1 + \epsilon) \text{OPT}(T, T), \quad (14)$$

where C is feasible w.r.t. $\text{TGP}(T, T)$ by Theorem 2.17. \square

5 Reducing the Size of the Discretization

While $O(n^2)$ guards and $O(n^3)$ witnesses, compare Observation 2.18, are satisfactory from a theoretical point of view, it is imperative to reduce their numbers for an efficient implementation. We reduce the size of our discretization and reduce the number of visibility calculations: Although not reducing the asymptotic size of the discretization, we still remove a large fraction—typically around 90% of the point guards and an even larger fraction of witnesses, compare Section 7. This is a key success factor for an implementation; switching off the wrong filter costs several orders of magnitude w.r.t. the solvable instance size.

Given a terrain T , the problem is to find a small $U' \subseteq U$ (where U is defined in Equation (5)), such that C is feasible w.r.t. $\text{TGP}(U', W(U'))$ if and only if it is feasible w.r.t. $\text{TGP}(U, W(U))$ and thus $\text{TGP}(T, T)$. A core issue is that visibility calculations are expensive in terms of both time and memory to store the results. Thus, the key challenge is to remove guard candidates from U *without determining their visibility region*. The guard filter in Section 5.2 has that feature.

We say that $g \in T$ *dominates* $g' \in T$ if $\mathcal{V}(g') \subseteq \mathcal{V}(g)$, in which case g' can be safely discarded. Our guard filters remove dominated guards. Two guard filters are proposed in Sections 5.1 and 5.2, and Sections 5.3 and 5.4 discuss witness filtering and an open question.

5.1 Filtering Dominated Guards

Let G be a set of guard candidates and T a terrain such that $\mathcal{V}(G) = T$. If we can identify distinct $g, g' \in G$ such that g dominates g' , then obviously $\text{OPT}(G, T) = \text{OPT}(G \setminus \{g'\}, T)$. However, checking whether g dominates g' takes $O(n)$ time, since visibility regions may consist of $O(n)$ subterrains, and it requires us to calculate the visibility regions of g and g' .

Moreover, domination only induces a partial ordering on G . Thus, removing all dominated guards from G would require $O(|G|^2)$ domination queries. Suppose we would directly apply that strategy to U from Equation (5): Since $|U| \in O(n^2)$ by Observation 2.6, this would result in $O(|U|^2 n) = O(n^5)$ time which is intolerable for an efficient implementation.

Instead of removing all dominated guard candidates, we devise a heuristic using $O(|G|)$ domination queries and thus an acceptable $O(n^3)$ time for $G = U$. Suppose G is ordered w.r.t. x -coordinates. Then the *local domination filter* removes all guard candidates that are dominated by their neighbors. This heuristic is based on the observation that neighboring guards' visibility regions often show a remarkable resemblance. Our experiments show that despite its $O(n^3)$ running time, this filtering strategy is beneficial in terms of both time and, more importantly, memory consumption, see Section 7.4.5.

5.2 Filtering Edge-Interior Guards

Lemma 2.13, Corollary 2.14, and Lemma 2.15 allow us to assume w.l.o.g. that all critical guards are located at the vertices. It follows that guards in the interior of an edge are not critical, i.e., only responsible for entire edges. We propose a filtering technique removing edge-interior guards that are not inclusion-minimal w.r.t. entire edges.




Figure 8: Edge-interior guards are only responsible for entire edges. Edges become visible only when crossing some $u \in U$, the arrows indicate in which direction. We only need to keep inclusion-maximal guard candidates w.r.t. entire edges; in this case there are two regions containing such candidates (marked in orange).

More formally, let U be the set of guard candidates from Equation (5). Consider all guard candidates in the interior of an edge e , $U_e := U \cap \text{int}(e)$, and recall that when moving a guard across $u \in U_e$, a vertex becomes either visible or invisible (depending on the direction) by construction of U . Furthermore, covering an entire edge is equivalent to seeing both its vertices. The sets of edges entirely seen by each $u \in U_e$,

$$E_u := \{e \in E \mid e \subseteq \mathcal{V}(u)\} = \{e_i \in E \mid v_i, v_{i+1} \in \mathcal{V}(u)\}, \quad (15)$$

define a partial ordering on U_e w.r.t. inclusion, compare Figure 8. Most importantly, u is inclusion-maximal if $E_{u'} \not\supseteq E_u$ for all $u' \in U_e$. We show that it suffices to consider the inclusion-maximal guard candidates:

Theorem 5.1. *Let $U'_e \subseteq U_e$ be the set that only contains inclusion-maximal guard candidates w.r.t. entire edges, as defined above. Then*

$$U' = (U \setminus U_e) \cup U'_e \quad (16)$$

admits covering T with the same number of guards as U and hence

$$\text{OPT}(U', T) = \text{OPT}(U, T). \quad (17)$$

Proof. A guard cannot be left- and right-guard at the same time by Lemma 2.15. Furthermore, by Lemma 2.13 (Corollary 2.14), a left-guard (right-guard) can be moved to its left (right) neighbor in V . Thus, w.l.o.g., $u \in U_e$ is no left- or right-guard, because U_e does not contain vertices by definition. Hence, no edge is critical w.r.t. u by Definition 2.8, so u is only responsible for covering entire edges and can be replaced by its inclusion-maximal sibling in U'_e without changing the feasibility or cardinality of a feasible cover of T . \square

The implication of Theorem 5.1 is that we can discard guard candidates in $U \setminus V$ that are not inclusion-maximal w.r.t. entire edges. At first glance, this might not look particularly helpful, but it admits a very efficient implementation that does not determine the visibility region of any candidate in $U \setminus V$, and removes up to 98% of the guard candidates. Both features make it a core ingredient of our implementation that removes the computational boundary between Terrain Guarding Problem with Vertex Guards (VTGP) and Continuous Terrain Guarding Problem (CTGP), compare Section 7.4.4.

The filter can be implemented using an efficient sweep line algorithm. For each $u \in U$, store a reference to which vertex's visibility region ends there, as well as whether it is situated to the left or to the right of u . This allows us to decide which vertex becomes visible or invisible when moving across u , depending on the direction, compare Figure 8. In other words, we can determine whether or not $v \in \mathcal{V}(u)$ for all $u \in U$ and $v \in V$ without explicitly determining $\mathcal{V}(u)$. As argued above, seeing an entire edge is equivalent to seeing both its end points, so the set of edges entirely seen can only change at points in U .

Hence we can, for every $e \in E$, sweep through U_e from left to right. While encountering $u \in U_e$ with *opening* visibility regions, we do nothing. When at some point we reach the first $u \in U_e$ where a visibility region *closes*, we report u (u is inclusion-maximal w.r.t. vertices, which is sufficient for being inclusion-maximal w.r.t. entire edges). After that we ignore all points corresponding to closing visibility regions until the first one opens, where we continue as above.

Observation 5.2. *This sweep line algorithm needs only the visibility regions of vertices, not those of $U \setminus V$. Deciding whether a vertex v becomes visible or invisible at $u \in U_e$ depends only on whether u is extremal in $\mathcal{V}(v)$ and on $v < u$, as described above.*

Observation 5.3. *While this filter shows great performance in our implementation, it does not reduce the $O(n^2)$ asymptotic complexity of U : Insert a vertex below each guard on the slopes in Figure 4, which then yields that U must contain a guard in each highlighted interval in each valley. Every other interval is inclusion-maximal w.r.t. the vertices on the slopes.*

5.3 Filtering Witnesses

Let U be a possibly filtered set of guard candidates. The construction of the witness set $W(U)$ as in Equation (3) already includes a filtering mechanism: As stated in Theorem 2.3, only inclusion-minimal witnesses need to be kept. Observe that a smaller, filtered, U automatically yields a smaller $W(U)$.

Additionally observe that in terms of an implementation, witnesses are far less expensive than guard candidates: They require no visibility region or coordinates, instead they only need to store references to the guards covering them, compare Observation 2.2.

We use the geometric structure of terrains to efficiently acquire only the locally inclusion-minimal witnesses, very much like in Section 5.2: Sort the extremal points of all guard candidates by their x -coordinates. For each of these points we know whether a visibility region opens or closes and to which guard it belongs. Sweeping through these points, it is straightforward to keep track of which guard candidates see the current event point. We only report those guard sets (i.e., witnesses) corresponding to a subterrain between a closing and an opening visibility region.

Observe that our approach keeps witnesses that are locally, but not necessarily globally, inclusion-minimal. The rationale is as follows: We can efficiently exploit the underlying geometry to identify the locally inclusion-minimal witnesses, but we do not see a way to do the same thing for globally inclusion-minimal witnesses. Furthermore, we formulate the problem as Integer Linear Program (IP), and use a sophisticated IP solver to solve it. This means that we benefit from the solver’s ability to deal with redundant constraints, which already proved to be the most successful strategy regarding witnesses in solvers for the closely related Art Gallery Problem (AGP) [10].

5.4 Open Problem

We would like to find an optimal discretization or show that ours is optimal. The open question is: What is an optimal discretization?

Obviously, a good discretization is small w.r.t. $|G| + |W|$. However, a discretization that minimizes $|G| + |W|$, is one where $|G| = \text{OPT}(T, T)$, i.e., just as hard to find as a minimum-cardinality guard cover of T . It thus makes sense to require a discretization to be obtainable in polynomial time.

Our discretization for the CTGP has size $|U| + |W(U)| \in O(n^3)$. The filters prove effective in practice by typically reducing, on average, its size by more than 90%, and our implementation suffers horribly when switching them off, compare Section 7. Nevertheless, we do not reduce the worst-case complexity of $O(n^3)$. Is there a discretization with guards G and witnesses W , obtainable in polynomial time, such that $|G| + |W| \in o(n^3)$?

6 Optimal Solutions with Linear Integer Programming

We combine the discretization devised in Section 2 and the filters to reduce its size from Section 5 to an efficient algorithm. It is capable of solving instances of the Terrain Guarding Problem (TGP) with up to 10^6 vertices within roughly 1-2 minutes on a standard desktop computer, compare Section 7. Furthermore, it is flexible enough to evaluate how our filtering frameworks perform in practice: They can be enabled individually.

6.1 IP Formulation

Let T be a terrain and let $G, W \subset T$ be finite sets of guard candidates and witnesses, such that $W \subseteq \mathcal{V}(G)$. We formulate TGP(G, W) as Integer Linear Program (IP):

$$\min \sum_{g \in G} x_g \tag{18}$$

$$\text{s.t. } \sum_{g \in w} x_g \geq 1 \quad \forall w \in W \tag{19}$$

$$x_g \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall g \in G. \tag{20}$$

A binary variable x_g for every guard candidate $g \in G$ indicates whether we pick g : $x_g = 1$ if and only if g is part of the cover. For each witness $w \in W$, a constraint ensures that w is covered by at least one guard (recall that we interpret a witness as the set of guards able to

<pre> input : Terrain T output: Guard cover of T 1: $(U, W) \leftarrow (V(T), \emptyset)$ ▷ vertices are guard candidates in both modes 2: for $u \in U$ do 3: \lfloor determine $\mathcal{V}(u)$ 4: if POINTGUARDS then ▷ as opposed to VERTEXGUARDS 5: $U \leftarrow U \cup \bigcup_{v \in V(T)} \{p \mid p \text{ is extremal in } \mathcal{V}(v)\}$ ▷ Equation (5) 6: if EDGEFILTER then 7: \lfloor filter edge-interior guards in U by sweep ▷ Section 5.2 8: for $u \in U \setminus V(T)$ do 9: \lfloor determine $\mathcal{V}(u)$ ▷ after EDGEFILTER, see Section 5.2 10: if DOMINATIONFILTER then 11: \lfloor filter out guards in U dominated by a neighbor ▷ Section 5.1 12: if WITNESSFILTER then 13: $W \leftarrow$ inclusion-minimal features from overlay of U ▷ Equation (3) 14: else 15: $W \leftarrow$ all features from overlay of U ▷ unfiltered version of Equation (3) 16: solve TGP(U, W) with an IP solver </pre>

Algorithm 1: Optimal solutions for the TGP.

cover it, compare Observation 2.2). The objective function is the number of guards picked for the cover, which is minimized.

Choosing $G = U$ (possibly filtered) and $W = W(U)$ from Equations (5) and (3), (18) – (20) models the Continuous Terrain Guarding Problem (CTGP); picking $G = V$ and $W = W(V)$ models the Terrain Guarding Problem with Vertex Guards (VTGP). In the remaining part of this section we show how to use the techniques developed in this paper to efficiently solve large instances of the CTGP and VTGP.

6.2 Algorithm

We cast the theory developed in this paper into Algorithm 1. It has two modes: POINTGUARDS for solving TGP(T, T) and VERTEXGUARDS for TGP(V, T). Everything except lines 4-9 applies to both POINTGUARDS and VERTEXGUARDS mode, lines 4-9 generate non-vertex-guard candidates and possibly filter them.

Our filtering mechanisms can be activated individually: The local domination filter from Section 5.1, DOMINATIONFILTER, removes all guard candidates that are dominated by one of their neighbors. It is run after non-vertex-guard candidates have been initialized (and possibly filtered) in lines 10-11. The guard filter EDGEFILTER corresponds to the guard filter from Section 5.2 and is only available in the POINTGUARDS mode. WITNESSFILTER determines whether only the inclusion-minimal witness shall be used, compare Equation (3). It is applied in lines 12-13 after all guards have been initialized and filtered.

Consider the solving step at line 16 of Algorithm 1. It is interesting in several aspects.

First of all, it is the only subroutine which requires exponential time, owed of course to the NP-hardness of the TGP [30]. For the randomly generated instances of the Terrain Guarding Problem Instance Library (TGPIL) [20], it turns out that this is not the bottleneck of our algorithm: The geometric subroutines require most time and memory, where the latter puts a limit on what we can solve. We discuss this in-depth in Section 7.4.8.

The second observation regarding the solver step is the following: Algorithm 1 essentially transforms an instance of VTGP or CTGP into a small discretization, which is then handed to a solver. We test with an IP solver, but a SAT solver, a Set Cover (SC) approximation algorithm, an implementation of the Polynomial Time Approximation Scheme (PTAS) by Gibson et al. [22], or any other solver (even one that is oblivious to the underlying geometry) would work. This is possible because at the end of the day, $TGP(G, W)$ is a SC instance. Observe that the entire variety of possible solvers greatly benefits from our filtering framework. However, since benchmarking the underlying solver is not our primary concern, we restrict our experiments to using an IP solver.

6.3 Implementation

We implemented Algorithm 1 in C++11 and compiled with g++-4.8.4 [21]. The geometric part of our implementation heavily relies on CGAL-4.6 [4] (Computational Geometry Algorithms Library); note that we have to follow the Exact Geometric Computation (EGC) paradigm to guarantee the correctness of our solutions. Additionally, we use the terrain visibility algorithm implementation by Haas and Hemmer [24]. We solve IPs using CPLEX-12.6.0 [9]. Furthermore, our implementation uses various features of boost-1.58.0 [2], as well as simple-svg-1.0.0 [39] for visualization.

7 Experiments


We evaluate our algorithm and the various filters that reduce the size of the discretization. It turns out that our filtering techniques prove critical to success in that switching off the wrong filters—especially `EDGEFILTER` and `WITNESSFILTER`, compare Sections 5.2 and 5.3, respectively—can cost us up to two orders of magnitude in terms of solvable instance size.

We use one subsection each to describe our instances (Section 7.1), list the tested configurations of Algorithm 1 (Section 7.2), describe the experimental setup (Section 7.3), and present our findings (Section 7.4).


7.1 Instances

We test four classes of random terrains from the 2015-08-06 version of the Terrain Guarding Problem Instance Library (TGPIL) [20], compare Figure 9. Every class comprises 20 instances with 10^3 , 10^4 , 10^5 , $5 \cdot 10^5$, and 10^6 vertices each yielding 400 instances.


The basic class is `WALK`, see Figure 9(a). An instance contains n vertices with x -coordinates $0, 1, \dots, n-1$, where the i -th y -coordinate is a random offset from the $(i-1)$ -st. `SINEWALK`, as in Figure 9(b), is the sum of a `WALK` instance added to a stretched sine wave. The `PARABOLAWALK` instances are the sum of a parabola and a `WALK`, compare Figure 9(c). `SINEWALK` and `PARABOLAWALK` pose a challenge because visibility regions




(a) WALK: Random walk with uniform step width.



(b) SINEWALK: Stepwise sum of sine function and random walk.



(c) PARABOLA WALK: Stepwise sum of parabola and random walk.



(d) CONCAVE VALLEYS: Optimal solutions require point guards in valley centers.

Figure 9: Four classes of randomly generated test instances available in the TGPIIL [20].

Configuration	Mode	EDGEFILTER	DOMINATIONFILTER	WITNESSFILTER
VDEFAULT	VERTEXGUARDS	n/a	yes	yes
VNoDOM	VERTEXGUARDS	n/a	no	yes
VNoW	VERTEXGUARDS	n/a	yes	no
PDEFAULT	POINTGUARDS	yes	yes	yes
PNoEDGE	POINTGUARDS	no	yes	yes
PNoDOM	POINTGUARDS	yes	no	yes
PNoW	POINTGUARDS	yes	yes	no

Table 1: Algorithm configurations, VTGP above and CTGP below.

often are severely fragmented: Many points see a large portion on the opposite side of the valley, but it is fragmented by the shadows of local features.

Our last instance class is `CONCAVEVALLEYS`, compare Figure 9(d). Since preliminary experiments revealed that the above instance classes hardly require non-vertex guards for optimal solutions, this class is designed to encourage them. An instance starts as a `WALK`. Then, we iteratively pick a random edge and replace it by a valley with concave slopes on each side, connected by a bottom edge. The slopes are arranged in a way that there is a point in the interior of the bottom edge that covers both slopes. An optimal solution for such a terrain usually requires guards in bottom edges’ interiors.

Observe that none of the above classes of randomly generated test instances deliberately provokes the NP-hardness of the Terrain Guarding Problem (TGP); they are not designed to contain a reduction of hard instances of e.g. `PLANAR 3SAT` as used in the NP-hardness proof of King and Krohn [30]. In our case, testing such instances is beside the point: We provide and test the means to efficiently transform a terrain into a small discretization that can be handed to some solver (Integer Linear Program (IP), Polynomial Time Approximation Scheme (PTAS), SAT, or other). Such a transformation has to be of low overhead, and our experiments are designed to verify just that. Feeding combinatorially hard instances into our algorithm only benchmarks the underlying solver.

7.2 Configurations

We test our implementation of Algorithm 1 in several configurations. The idea is to assess the efficiency of each filtering technique, compare Section 5, individually. There are seven configurations forming two groups: `VDEFAULT`, `VNoDOM`, and `VNoW` test the `VERTEXGUARDS` mode; `PDEFAULT`, `PNoEDGE`, `PNoDOM`, and `PNoW` test the considerably harder `POINTGUARDS` mode. Table 1 specifies each configuration. Recall that the `EDGEFILTER` feature only applies to the guard candidates of the Continuous Terrain Guarding Problem (CTGP) and thus plays no role in the vertex guard configurations. Since we test 400 instances, this results in a total of 2800 test runs.

7.3 Experimental Setup

We ran the experiments on eight identical Linux 3.13-powered machines with Intel Core i7-3770 CPUs running at 3.4 GHz, provided with 8 MB of cache and 16 GB of main memory. Every run was limited to 15 minutes of CPU time and to 14 GB of memory; the latter

Configuration	Instance	#vertices				
		10^3	10^4	10^5	$5 \cdot 10^5$	10^6
VDEFAULT	WALK	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %
	SINEWALK	100 %	100 %	100 %	0 %	0 %
	PARABOLA WALK	100 %	100 %	100 %	0 %	0 %
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %
VNoDOM	WALK	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %
	SINEWALK	100 %	100 %	100 %	0 %	0 %
	PARABOLA WALK	100 %	100 %	100 %	0 %	0 %
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %
VNoW	WALK	100 %	100 %	100 %	0 %	0 %
	SINEWALK	100 %	100 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
	PARABOLA WALK	100 %	25 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	100 %	100 %	100 %	0 %	0 %
PDEFAULT	WALK	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %
	SINEWALK	100 %	100 %	100 %	0 %	0 %
	PARABOLA WALK	100 %	100 %	100 %	0 %	0 %
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %
PNoEDGE	WALK	100 %	100 %	100 %	55 %	0 %
	SINEWALK	100 %	100 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
	PARABOLA WALK	100 %	100 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	100 %	100 %	100 %	90 %	0 %
PNoDOM	WALK	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %
	SINEWALK	100 %	100 %	100 %	0 %	0 %
	PARABOLA WALK	100 %	100 %	100 %	0 %	0 %
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %
PNoW	WALK	100 %	100 %	100 %	0 %	0 %
	SINEWALK	100 %	100 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
	PARABOLA WALK	100 %	20 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	100 %	100 %	100 %	0 %	0 %

Table 2: Solution rates for each configuration, instance class, and instance complexity.

ensuring fairness w.r.t. memory bottlenecks, compare Section 7.4.8. No part of our software, except solving IPs with CPLEX, uses parallelism. Refer to Section 6.3 for details on language, compiler, required libraries, etc.

7.4 Results

The solution rates and median solution times of every combination of configuration, instance class, and instance complexity are listed in Tables 2 and 3. We dedicate a section each to the hardness of the instance classes (Section 7.4.1), an overview of each mode (VERTEXGUARDS and POINTGUARDS modes in Sections 7.4.2 and 7.4.3), the impact of each filtering technique (EDGEFILTER, DOMINATIONFILTER, and WITNESSFILTER in Sections 7.4.4, 7.4.5, and 7.4.6), timing behavior (Section 7.4.7), and memory consumption (Section 7.4.8).

Configuration	Instance	#vertices				
		10^3	10^4	10^5	$5 \cdot 10^5$	10^6
VDEFAULT	WALK	0.0 s	0.2 s	2.9 s	18.0 s	40.3 s
	SINEWALK	0.0 s	0.9 s	13.8 s	n/a	n/a
	PARABOLA WALK	0.1 s	1.8 s	21.7 s	n/a	n/a
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	0.2 s	2.4 s	24.2 s	177.2 s	337.6 s
VNoDOM	WALK	0.0 s	0.3 s	3.6 s	21.8 s	48.6 s
	SINEWALK	0.1 s	1.3 s	18.2 s	n/a	n/a
	PARABOLA WALK	0.1 s	2.5 s	27.8 s	n/a	n/a
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	0.2 s	2.4 s	24.3 s	177.1 s	411.0 s
VNoW	WALK	0.0 s	0.4 s	8.8 s	n/a	n/a
	SINEWALK	0.1 s	6.4 s	n/a	n/a	n/a
	PARABOLA WALK	0.4 s	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	0.2 s	2.7 s	32.0 s	n/a	n/a
PDEFAULT	WALK	0.0 s	0.3 s	4.6 s	27.9 s	62.4 s
	SINEWALK	0.1 s	1.7 s	26.3 s	n/a	n/a
	PARABOLA WALK	0.2 s	3.3 s	45.1 s	n/a	n/a
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	0.1 s	0.8 s	10.3 s	68.2 s	137.4 s
PNoEDGE	WALK	0.2 s	4.5 s	79.7 s	833.3 s	n/a
	SINEWALK	1.0 s	58.8 s	n/a	n/a	n/a
	PARABOLA WALK	4.1 s	220.3 s	n/a	n/a	n/a
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	0.2 s	3.2 s	58.3 s	652.3 s	n/a
PNoDOM	WALK	0.0 s	0.4 s	5.0 s	31.5 s	70.4 s
	SINEWALK	0.1 s	2.0 s	31.1 s	n/a	n/a
	PARABOLA WALK	0.2 s	4.0 s	51.8 s	n/a	n/a
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	0.1 s	0.9 s	10.7 s	68.0 s	145.5 s
PNoW	WALK	0.0 s	0.6 s	10.4 s	n/a	n/a
	SINEWALK	0.1 s	7.8 s	n/a	n/a	n/a
	PARABOLA WALK	0.6 s	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	0.1 s	1.1 s	20.8 s	n/a	n/a

Table 3: Median solution times per configuration, instance class, and instance complexity.

Configuration	Instance	#vertices				
		10^3	10^4	10^5	$5 \cdot 10^5$	10^6
PNoDOM	WALK	80.1 %	86.8 %	89.5 %	91.0 %	91.7 %
	SINEWALK	92.7 %	97.6 %	98.3 %	n/a	n/a
	PARABOLA WALK	97.5 %	98.8 %	98.9 %	n/a	n/a
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	65.8 %	72.5 %	77.7 %	79.9 %	80.6 %

Table 4: Median percentage of guard candidates removed by the EDGEFILTER.

7.4.1 Overview – Instances

A quick glance at Tables 2 and 3 reveals that SINEWALK and PARABOLA WALK instances are harder to solve than WALK and CONCAVE VALLEYS. This is to be expected, since WALK is contained in the form of noise in other instances, and since the sole purpose of CONCAVE VALLEYS is to provide an instance type that encourages the placement of non-vertex guards, compare Section 7.1. Furthermore, SINEWALK and PARABOLA WALK instances comprise valleys facing each other, resulting in highly fragmented visibility regions. The result is that the visibility overlays consist of numerous tiny subterrains, and a larger portion of the $O(n^2)$ guards and $O(n^3)$ witnesses, compare Observation 2.18, cannot be eliminated. This induces time and memory intensive calculations and a complex IP, making SINEWALK and PARABOLA WALK challenging instance classes.

7.4.2 Overview – Vertex Guards

VDEFAULT and VNoDOM solve all instances of WALK and CONCAVE VALLEYS, and the SINEWALK and PARABOLA WALK instances of up to 10^5 vertices; VNOW can only solve instances which are roughly one order of magnitude smaller, see Table 2. From this point it is already clear that WITNESSFILTER is crucial to a successful implementation. VDEFAULT and VNoDOM have comparable running times, with a slight advantage for VDEFAULT, compare Table 3, where VNOW is slower w.r.t. the instances that it can solve.

7.4.3 Overview – Point Guards

In terms of percentage of solved instances, compare Table 2, PDEFAULT and PNoDOM are the strongest configurations; both solve all WALK and CONCAVE VALLEYS instances as well as the SINEWALK and PARABOLA WALK instances with up to 10^5 vertices. PNOW and PNoEDGE are considerably weaker. Considering the median solution times in Table 3, one can observe that PDEFAULT is slightly faster than PNoDOM. Furthermore, PNoEDGE performs horribly as compared to PDEFAULT.

7.4.4 Impact of Filtering Edge-Interior Guards

Filtering edge-interior guards corresponds to the EDGEFILTER feature, which is only available in POINTGUARDS mode, not in VERTEXGUARDS mode. For a detailed description of EDGEFILTER, refer to Section 5.2. Table 4 depicts the percentage of guards removed by EDGEFILTER in the PNoDOM configuration, and Figure 10 illustrates the effectiveness of EDGEFILTER using a 10^5 -vertex PARABOLA WALK instance as example. Observe that




Figure 10: The effect of our filtering techniques (excerpt of a 10^5 -vertex PARABOLAWALK instance). Each white circle represents a guard candidate. (a) is unfiltered, (b) filtered.

PNO_{DOM} is the only configuration where we can properly obtain these numbers, since all the others filter guards in an incompatible way.

EDGEFILTER proves to be our most effective guard filter by removing roughly 90% (80%) of the guard candidates in the 10^6 vertex WALK (CONCAVEVALLEYS) instances, and well above 95% in the largest solved SINEWALK and PARABOLAWALK instances. As pointed out in Section 7.4.3, it is obvious from Tables 2 and 3 that EDGEFILTER massively improves performance in terms of both, solution rates and median solution times.

Recall that EDGEFILTER works with an efficient sweep line algorithm that does not obtain any non-vertex-guards' visibility regions, thus saving a crucial amount of both time and memory. EDGEFILTER clearly is a key success factor when solving the CTGP, i.e., in POINTGUARDS mode: Without it, PNOEDGE would be the state of the art, meaning that we could solve 10^5 to 10^6 vertex instances of the Terrain Guarding Problem with Vertex Guards (VTGP), but only instances at least one order of magnitude smaller for the CTGP, and that we would require much more time to do so. EDGEFILTER essentially removes the barrier between VTGP and CTGP.

7.4.5 Impact of Filtering Dominated Guards

Refer to Section 5.1 for a detailed description of how DOMINATIONFILTER works. Table 5 displays the percentage of guard candidates that DOMINATIONFILTER filtered out in the VDEFAULT and PNOEDGE configurations. Observe that we need to obtain these figures in configurations where no other filter is active.

In both, VERTEXGUARDS and POINTGUARDS mode, DOMINATIONFILTER has no impact on the solution rates within the limits specified in Section 7.3. However, VDEFAULT

Configuration	Instance	#vertices				
		10^3	10^4	10^5	$5 \cdot 10^5$	10^6
VDEFAULT	WALK	65.8 %	64.1 %	63.6 %	63.5 %	63.5 %
	SINEWALK	58.5 %	63.0 %	63.6 %	n/a	n/a
	PARABOLA WALK	59.9 %	63.3 %	63.6 %	n/a	n/a
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	13.4 %	13.1 %	13.3 %	13.3 %	13.3 %
PNoEDGE	WALK	92.9 %	94.7 %	95.6 %	95.8 %	n/a
	SINEWALK	88.1 %	96.7 %	n/a	n/a	n/a
	PARABOLA WALK	93.2 %	98.0 %	n/a	n/a	n/a
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	77.1 %	80.5 %	83.9 %	85.0 %	n/a

Table 5: Median percentage of guard candidates removed by the DOMINATIONFILTER.

Configuration	Instance	#vertices				
		10^3	10^4	10^5	$5 \cdot 10^5$	10^6
VDEFAULT	WALK	91.9 %	94.3 %	95.4 %	96.1 %	96.4 %
	SINEWALK	95.8 %	98.8 %	99.3 %	n/a	n/a
	PARABOLA WALK	98.6 %	99.4 %	99.5 %	n/a	n/a
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	76.5 %	80.5 %	83.7 %	85.1 %	85.5 %
PDEFAULT	WALK	91.9 %	94.3 %	95.5 %	96.1 %	96.4 %
	SINEWALK	96.3 %	98.9 %	99.3 %	n/a	n/a
	PARABOLA WALK	98.7 %	99.5 %	99.5 %	n/a	n/a
	CONCAVE VALLEYS	80.3 %	84.2 %	87.4 %	88.7 %	89.1 %

Table 6: Median percentage of witnesses removed by the WITNESSFILTER.

and PDEFAULT are slightly faster than VNODOM and PNODOM, respectively. But observe that the key advantage of DOMINATIONFILTER is not that it saves some seconds, but rather that it saves memory by removing dominated guard candidates. This is important, since memory consumption is the bottleneck of our implementation, compare Section 7.4.8.


7.4.6 Impact of Filtering Witnesses

The WITNESSFILTER, i.e., the feature of only using inclusion-minimal witnesses as described in Section 5.3 and Theorem 2.3, is one of the success factors. Table 6 shows which percentage of witnesses it removed in the VDEFAULT and PDEFAULT configurations.

Throughout our instances, WITNESSFILTER removes the vast majority of witnesses, often more than 95 % of them. Furthermore, Table 2 clearly shows that switching off WITNESSFILTER has a drastic effect on the solution rates: The size of solvable instances goes down by two orders of magnitude. Since WITNESSFILTER allows for an efficient sweep line implementation, see Section 5.3, it is both fast and useful.

7.4.7 Timing Behavior

We examine how much CPU time our configurations spend in which part of the algorithm. In order to obtain a meaningful comparison, we pick a combination of instance class and complexity that is large, but was still solved by every configuration: WALK with 10^5 vertices.



(a) VERTEXGUARDS mode, WALK, 10^5 vertices. (b) POINTGUARDS mode, WALK, 10^5 vertices.

Figure 11: Median CPU time spent by each configuration in each part of the algorithm.

The timing charts for other combinations are left out, as they permit the same interpretation. Figure 11 contains these charts, where Figure 11(a) displays the measurements for VERTEXGUARDS mode and Figure 11(b) those for POINTGUARDS mode.

The strongest impact comes from EDGEFILTER (it is disabled in the PNOEDGE configuration in the rightmost bar in Figure 11(b)), switching it off has a catastrophic impact on the running time. EDGEFILTER essentially closes the gap between POINTGUARDS and VERTEXGUARDS mode. Without it the time spent calculating visibility regions of unneeded guards drastically increases up to the point where it dominates the total running time. Paradoxically, guard filtering time also increases which is owed to the fact that the other guard filter, DOMINATIONFILTER, still is active and has more guards to compare.

WITNESSFILTER has the second-most important impact. Without it, IP solution times roughly double in both VERTEXGUARDS mode and POINTGUARDS mode. Again paradoxically, the time for generating all these witnesses does not change drastically, but instead the time for solving the IP does. This happens because the non-inclusion-minimal witnesses form constraints in the IP that are dominated by the inclusion-minimal witnesses' constraints. This in turn increases the workload of the IP solver which typically discards many dominated constraints in a preprocessing phase.

The timing behavior is only mildly influenced by the DOMINATIONFILTER feature. As described above, it has only a small advantage in terms of time, but it does not increase solution times and it is beneficial in w.r.t. memory consumption.

A general observation is that our implementation with all features enabled, i.e., VDEFAULT and PDEFAULT, reduces the computational overhead in terms of time so far that

a significant part of the time is spent solving the IP. This means that our filters allow the algorithm to spend its time solving the underlying instance of the NP-complete Set Cover (SC). We emphasize this, because it is not to be taken for granted; even the best solvers for the closely related Art Gallery Problem (AGP) have a much more significant overhead for geometric subroutines [10].

7.4.8 Memory Consumption

Within our hardware setup and using the PDEFAULT mode, even the largest instances with 10^6 vertices are solved within minutes, those that are not solved run out of memory, not time. That is, as long as the instances are not specifically designed to reveal the NP-hardness of the TGP, the limiting factor is memory.

There are two phases in Algorithm 1 that generate a significant amount of data which persists in memory. The first phase is the computation of all visibility regions of all vertices V in line 3, the extremal points of which define the unfiltered guard candidate set U . In PDEFAULT mode, EDGEFILTER removes the vast majority of candidates from U . The second phase determines all visibility regions of the points in $U \setminus V$ that were not discarded, generating the largest chunk of data (even when filtered) in line 9. It is used for determining the witnesses, which requires to compute and simultaneously hold the extremal points of all visibility regions of all remaining guard candidates in memory. We conjecture that this cannot be avoided since a guard at the far right of the terrain may still see a region at its very left, and we thus do not see how a way to apply the WITNESSFILTER before knowing all extremal points.

We remark that the memory bottleneck is amplified by the fact that we follow the Exact Geometric Computation (EGC) paradigm, which ensures a correct and consistent representation of all visibility regions and a correct order of all visibility events. Specifically, we do not store coordinates of points using double floating point arithmetic. We also do not use the other extreme, which would be an exact representation using arbitrary precision rationals as they are, e.g., provided by the GMP [23] library.

Instead, we rely on Computational Geometry Algorithms Library (CGAL) [4], more precisely on `CGAL::Exact_predicates_exact_constructions_kernel`, which provides lazy constructions: The idea is that each coordinate is initially represented by two doubles that represent an interval that contains the actual coordinate. In many cases this is sufficient to provide all necessary decisions, for instance, a comparison with another coordinate. However, in cases in which this is not enough the exact coordinates are computed with GMP. Compared to the pure exact approach this usually gives an significant advantage regarding speed but also regarding memory [36].

8 Conclusion

We construct a discretization of polynomial size for the continuous 1.5D Terrain Guarding Problem (TGP). This settles two prominent open questions: (1) The continuous TGP is a member of NP and, since NP-hardness is known [30], NP-complete, and (2) it admits a Polynomial Time Approximation Scheme (PTAS), because the PTAS for the discrete TGP [22] applies to our discretization.

We propose an algorithm finding optimal solutions for the TGP; our implementation solves instances with up to 10^6 vertices within minutes. A key success factor are filtering techniques reducing the size of our discretization: Our experiments show that reducing the geometric overhead is critical w.r.t. solving large instances. Furthermore, our filters essentially remove the computational barrier between the continuous and the discrete TGP.

References

- [1] Boaz Ben-Moshe, Matthew J. Katz, and Joseph S. B. Mitchell. A constant-factor approximation algorithm for optimal 1.5D terrain guarding. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 36(6):1631–1647, 2007.
- [2] boost C++ libraries. <http://www.boost.org/>.
- [3] Francisc Bungiu, Michael Hemmer, John Hershberger, Kan Huang, and Alexander Kröller. Efficient computation of visibility polygons. *CoRR*, abs/1403.3905, 2014.
- [4] CGAL (Computational Geometry Algorithms Library). <http://www.cgal.org/>.
- [5] Vasek Chvátal. A combinatorial theorem in plane geometry. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 18(1):39 – 41, 1975.
- [6] Kyung-Yong Chwa, Byung-Cheol Jo, Christian Knauer, Esther Moet, Ren van Oostum, and Chan-Su Shin. Guarding art galleries by guarding witnesses. In Rudolf Fleischer and Gerhard Trippen, editors, *Algorithms and Computation*, volume 3341 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 352–363. Springer, 2005.
- [7] Kenneth L. Clarkson and Kasturi R. Varadarajan. Improved approximation algorithms for geometric set cover. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 37(1):43–58, 2007.
- [8] Marcelo C. Couto, Pedro J. de Rezende, and Cid C. de Souza. An exact algorithm for minimizing vertex guards on art galleries. *International Transactions in Operational Research*, 18(4):425–448, 2011.
- [9] IBM ILOG CPLEX Optimization Studio. <http://www.ibm.com/software/integration/optimization/cplex-optimizer/>.
- [10] Pedro J. de Rezende, Cid C. de Souza, Stephan Friedrichs, Michael Hemmer, Alexander Kröller, and Davi C. Tozoni. Engineering art galleries. *Submitted for publication*, 2014.
- [11] Stephane Durocher, Pak Ching Li, and Saeed Mehrabi. Guarding orthogonal terrains. In *Proceedings of the 27th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry*, pages 220–227, 2015.
- [12] Stephan Eidenbenz. Approximation algorithms for terrain guarding. *Information Processing Letters*, 82(2):99–105, 2002.
- [13] Stephan Eidenbenz, Christoph Stamm, and Peter Widmayer. Inapproximability results for guarding polygons and terrains. *Algorithmica*, 31(1):79–113, 2001.

- [14] Khaled M. Elbassioni, Erik Krohn, Domagoj Matijevic, Julián Mestre, and Domagoj Severdija. Improved approximations for guarding 1.5-dimensional terrains. *Algorithmica*, 60(2):451–463, 2011.
- [15] Maximilian Ernestus, Stephan Friedrichs, Michael Hemmer, Jan Kokemüller, Alexander Kröller, Mahdi Moeni, and Christiane Schmidt. Algorithms for art gallery illumination. In *Submitted for publication*, 2015.
- [16] Sándor P. Fekete, Stephan Friedrichs, Alexander Kröller, and Christiane Schmidt. Facets for art gallery problems. *Algorithmica*, pages 1–30, 2014.
- [17] Steve Fisk. A short proof of Chvátal’s watchman theorem. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 24(3):374, 1978.
- [18] Stephan Friedrichs, Michael Hemmer, and Christiane Schmidt. A PTAS for the continuous 1.5D terrain guarding problem. In *Proceedings of the 26th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry*, pages 367–373, 2014.
- [19] Stephan Friedrichs, Michael Hemmer, and Christiane Schmidt. Exact solutions for the continuous terrain guarding problem. In *31st European Workshop on Computational Geometry, EuroCG*, pages 212–215, 2015.
- [20] Stephan Friedrichs, Michael Hemmer, and Christiane Schmidt. Terrain guarding problem instance library. <http://resources.mpi-inf.mpg.de/tgp/index.html#instances>, August 2015. Version 2015-08-06.
- [21] The GNU compiler collection. <http://gcc.gnu.org/>.
- [22] Matt Gibson, Gaurav Kanade, Erik Krohn, and Kasturi R. Varadarajan. Guarding terrains via local search. *Journal of Computational Geometry*, 5(1):168–178, 2014.
- [23] The GNU multiple precision arithmetic library. <https://gmplib.org/>.
- [24] Andreas Haas and Michael Hemmer. Efficient Algorithms and Implementations for Visibility in 1.5D Terrains. In *EuroCG*, pages 216–219, 2015.
- [25] Ferran Hurtado, Maarten Löffler, Inês Matos, Vera Sacristán, Maria Saumell, Rodrigo I. Silveira, and Frank Staals. Terrain visibility with multiple viewpoints. *International Journal of Computational Geometry & Applications*, 24(4):275–306, 2014.
- [26] Jeff Kahn, Maria Klawe, and Daniel Kleitman. Traditional art galleries require fewer watchmen. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic and Discrete Methods*, 4(2):194–206, 1983.
- [27] Matthew J. Katz and Gabriel S. Roisman. On guarding the vertices of rectilinear domains. *Computational Geometry Theory and Applications*, 39(3):219–228, 2008.
- [28] James King. Errata on “a 4-approximation for guarding 1.5-dimensional terrains”. http://www.cs.mcgill.ca/~jking/papers/4apx_latin.pdf. Visited on August 20, 2015.

- [29] James King. A 4-approximation algorithm for guarding 1.5-dimensional terrains. In Jos R. Correa, Alejandro Hevia, and Marcos A. Kiwi, editors, *LATIN*, volume 3887 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 629–640. Springer, 2006.
- [30] James King and Erik Krohn. Terrain guarding is NP-hard. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 40(5):1316–1339, 2011.
- [31] Alexander Kröller, Tobias Baumgartner, Sándor P. Fekete, and Christiane Schmidt. Exact solutions and bounds for general art gallery problems. *Journal of Experimental Algorithms*, 2012.
- [32] Aldo Laurentini. Guarding the walls of an art gallery. *The Visual Computer*, 15(6):265–278, 1999.
- [33] Der-Tsai Lee and Arthur K. Lin. Computational complexity of art gallery problems. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 32(2):276–282, 1986.
- [34] Joseph O’Rourke. *Art Gallery Theorems and Algorithms*. International Series of Monographs on Computer Science. Oxford University Press, New York, NY, 1987.
- [35] Joseph O’Rourke and Kenneth Supowit. Some NP-hard polygon decomposition problems. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 29(2):181–190, Mar 1983.
- [36] Sylvain Pion and Andreas Fabri. A generic lazy evaluation scheme for exact geometric computations. *Science of Computer Programming*, 76(4):307–323, 2011.
- [37] Dietmar Schuchardt and Hans-Dietrich Hecker. Two NP-hard art-gallery problems for ortho-polygons. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 41:261–267, 1995.
- [38] Thomas C. Shermer. Recent results in art galleries. In *Proceedings of the IEEE*, volume 80, pages 1384–1399, 1992.
- [39] simple-svg. <http://code.google.com/p/simple-svg/>.