

Lower Bounds for Fundamental Geometric Problems

by

Jeffrey Gordon Erickson

B.A. (Rice University) 1987

M.S. (University of California at Irvine) 1992

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

Computer Science

in the

GRADUATE DIVISION

of the

UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA at BERKELEY

Committee in charge:

Professor Raimund Seidel, Chair

Professor Umesh Vazirani

Professor Bernd Sturmfels

Fall 1996

The dissertation of Jeffrey Gordon Erickson is approved:

Chair

Date

Date

Date

University of California at Berkeley

Fall 1996

Lower Bounds for Fundamental Geometric Problems

Copyright 1996

by

Jeffrey Gordon Erickson

Abstract

Lower Bounds for Fundamental Geometric Problems

by

Jeffrey Gordon Erickson

Doctor of Philosophy in Computer Science

University of California at Berkeley

Professor Raimund Seidel, Chair

We develop lower bounds on the number of primitive operations required to solve several fundamental problems in computational geometry. For example, given a set of points in the plane, are any three colinear? Given a set of points and lines, does any point lie on a line? These and similar questions arise as subproblems or special cases of a large number of more complicated geometric problems, including point location, range searching, motion planning, collision detection, ray shooting, and hidden surface removal.

Previously these problems were studied only in general models of computation, but known techniques for these models are too weak to prove useful results. Our approach is to consider, for each problem, a more specialized model of computation that is still rich enough to describe all known algorithms for that problem. Thus, our results formally demonstrate inherent limitations of current algorithmic techniques. Our lower bounds dramatically improve previously known results and in most cases match known upper bounds, at least up to polylogarithmic factors.

In the first part of the thesis, we develop lower bounds for several degeneracy-detection problems, using *adversary arguments*. For example, we show that detecting colinear triples of points requires $\Omega(n^2)$ sidedness queries in the worst case. Our lower bound follows from the construction of a set of points in general position with several “collapsible” triangles, any one of which can be made degenerate without changing the orientation of any other triangle. Using similar techniques, we prove lower bounds for deciding, given a set of points in \mathbb{R}^d , whether any $d + 1$ points lie on a hyperplane, whether any $d + 2$ points lie on a sphere, or whether the convex hull of the point is simplicial.

In the second part, we consider offline range searching problems, which are usually solved using geometric divide-and-conquer techniques. To study these problems, we introduce the class of *partitioning algorithms*. We prove that any partitioning algorithm requires $\Omega(n^{4/3})$ time to detect point-line incidences in the worst case. Using similar techniques, we prove an $\Omega(n^{4/3})$ lower bound for deciding if a set of points lies entirely above a set of hyperplanes in dimensions five and higher.

Professor Raimund Seidel
Dissertation Committee Chair

To Nancy, who asked, “Then what?”.

*It was a large room. Full of people. All kinds.
And they had all arrived at the same building at more or less the same time.
And they were all free.
And they were all asking themselves the same question:
What is behind that curtain?*

— Laurie Anderson, “Born, Never Asked”, *Big Science*, 1982

Contents

List of Figures	vi
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Old Results	2
1.1.1 Output Size	2
1.1.2 Decision Trees	3
1.1.3 Semigroup Arithmetic	7
1.2 New Results	9
I Adversary Lower Bounds	12
2 Affine Degeneracies	13
2.1 Lower Bounds for a Restricted Problem	15
2.1.1 The Planar Lower Bound	16
2.1.2 Higher Dimensions	17
2.1.3 Beating the Lower Bound	18
2.2 Lower Bounds for The General Problem	20
2.2.1 An Alternate Proof in Two Dimensions	22
2.3 Allowable Queries	23
2.4 Implications and Open Problems	26
2.5 Out on a Limb	28
3 Convex Hull Problems	31
3.1 Preliminaries	32
3.2 The Lower Bound	33
3.3 Real Convex Hull Algorithms	37
3.4 Open Problems	38
4 Spherical Degeneracies	40
4.1 Circular Degeneracies	41
4.2 Proper Spherical Degeneracies	42
4.3 Open Problems	45

5	Linear Satisfiability Problems	47
5.1	Preliminaries	49
5.2	The Lower Bound	50
5.2.1	The Infinitesimal Adversary Configuration	51
5.2.2	Moving Back to the Reals	55
5.2.3	Perturbing into General Position	57
5.3	Matching Nonuniform Upper Bounds	58
5.4	Conclusions and Open Problems	59
II	Divide-and-Conquer Lower Bounds	61
6	Hopcroft's Problem	62
6.1	Easy Quadratic Lower Bounds	64
6.2	Incidences and Monochromatic Covers	68
6.2.1	One Dimension	69
6.2.2	Two Dimensions	71
6.2.3	Three Dimensions	72
6.2.4	Higher Dimensions	76
6.2.5	A Lower Bound in the Semigroup Model	80
6.3	Partitioning Algorithms	81
6.3.1	The Basic Lower Bound	82
6.3.2	The Lower Bound for the Decision Problem	83
6.3.3	The Lower Bound for the Counting Problem	85
6.3.4	Containment Shortcuts Don't Help	86
6.4	Real Algorithms for Hopcroft's Problem	88
6.5	Conclusions and Open Problems	90
7	Halfspace Emptiness	92
7.1	Projective Polyhedra	93
7.2	Polyhedral Separation	96
7.3	Polyhedral Covers	99
7.4	Polyhedral Partitioning Algorithms	102
7.5	Conclusions and Open Problems	106
	Bibliography	108
	Index of Notation	122
	Index	124

List of Figures

2.1	A planar adversary construction for nonvertical degeneracies.	16
2.2	The dual version of our planar adversary construction.	17
2.3	A planar adversary construction for arbitrary degeneracies.	22
2.4	Another planar adversary construction for arbitrary degeneracies.	23
2.5	Minimum area triangles are not necessarily collapsible.	27
3.1	The convex hull adversary construction in three dimensions.	36
6.1	An easy adversary construction for Hopcroft's problem.	65
6.2	A harder adversary construction for Hopcroft's problem	66
6.3	Collections of points and lines with simple relative orientation matrices. . .	69
6.4	$I_3(n, m) = mn$. Every point lies on every plane.	73
6.5	Comparison of lower bounds for $\mu_2^\circ(n, m)$ and $\mu_3^\circ(n, m)$	76
6.6	Eliminating containment shortcuts.	87
7.1	The suspension and projection of a polygon by a point.	95
7.2	Worst-case configuration for halfspace emptiness.	103

Acknowledgements

*The scariest thing about saying your thank-yous
is the certainty that you will leave someone out.
In the meantime... Well, there's nothing for it but:
It's a list of names, and a long one.*

— Neil Gaiman, Afterword to *Sandman*, 1996

Most of my research at Berkeley was supported by Raimund Seidel's NSF PYI grant CCR-9058440 and by a GAANN fellowship. Other research was done at Smith College during the 1993 Regional Geometry Institute (funded by NSF grant DMS-9013220), Universität des Saarlandes, the Max-Planck-Institut für Informatik (unofficially), Freie Universität Berlin, and Universiteit Utrecht. Thanks to Joe O'Rourke, Emo Welzl, Otfried Schwarzkopf, and especially Kurt Mehlhorn for their hospitality. Most of this thesis has been previously published [73, 74, 76, 78] or will be soon [77], although I have made several corrections and additions.

As much as I may have tried, a thesis is far from an individual effort. I am particularly grateful to Raimund Seidel, Umesh Vazirani, and Bernd Sturmfels for their careful reading of the thesis and their helpful suggestions. Comments by anonymous readers and referees led to several significant improvements in both content and presentation, and the elimination of at least one major bug. While credit can and should be spread around, blame should never be; all remaining errors are my own responsibility!

Raimund Seidel has been an wonderful advisor and a good friend for the last four years. I thank him for his guidance, his humor, his sanity, and his (im)patience; I only wish my timing had been better. I would also like to thank Martina Seidel for her hospitality in Saarbrücken, and Miriam Seidel for letting me play with her stuffed animals.

It is impossible to overstate the influence of the Berkeley theory group. Dick Karp, who introduced me to adversaries and little birdies, is without question the best teacher I have ever had. Umesh Vazirani introduced me to complexity theory, somehow making it seem simple. John Canny introduced me to semi-algebraic sets and their potential uses in computational geometry, although the result is probably not what he had in mind. Thanks also to the many profs, grads, undergrads, and postdocs who put up with my stupid questions, and who offered their own much better questions in return, especially Micah Adler, Nina Amenta, Sanjeev Arora, Elwyn Berlekamp, Ethan Bernstein, John Binder, Manuel

Blum, David Forsyth, Dan Garcia, Mor Harchol-Balter, Ari Juels, Mike Mitzenmacher, Sridhar Rajagopalan, Troy Shahoumian, Alistair Sinclair, Dan Spielman, Bernd Sturmfels, Randi Thomas, Taku Tokuyasu, Hal Wasserman, and David Wolfe. Hopefully no one will be disappointed that my thesis only mentions randomization once. Finally, thanks to Caffé Nefeli for the daily fix.

I am deeply indebted to David Eppstein for introducing me to computational geometry, my first taste of real theoretical research, and a thoroughly unrealistic standard of productivity. The other Irvine theory faculty—Mike Dillencourt, Dan Hirschberg, and George Lueker—also supported and inspired my transition from professional software engineer to amateur theoretical computer scientist. I would especially like to thank Dick Taylor for letting me into graduate school against his (and the admissions committee's) better judgment.

I am honored that the computational geometry community has welcomed me into their ranks. An early visit with Marshall Bern and David Dobkin at Xerox PARC was an inspiration. Whether they realize it or not, the interest and encouragement of Scot Drysdale and Mike Goodrich have been invaluable. Extra special thanks to Jack Snoeyink and Emo Welzl for service far above and beyond the call of duty.

Without my “real world” work experience, first at StyleWare and later at Claris, I might never have learned how to turn knowledge and inspiration into something concrete. Thanks especially to Bob Hearn, Scott Holdaway, Scott Lindsey, Paul Lee, Ernie Pan, Syd Polk, and my dog Bo-bo for their friendship and humor.

My parents, Jon Erickson and Constance Cook, have encouraged and supported my bizarre mathematical habits for as long as I can remember. None of this would have been possible without the numerous opportunities that they gave me.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife Kim Whittlesey for her love and enthusiastic support. I hope the next seventy years will be as wonderful as the last seven.