


AD-A084 959

ILLINOIS UNIV AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN APPLIED COMPUTATION—ETC F/S 12/1  
FINDING THE CONTOUR OF A UNION OF ISO-ORIENTED RECTANGLES.(U)  
AUG 79 W LIPSKI, F P PREPARATA DAAG89-78-C-0016  
ML

UNCLASSIFIED  
ACT-16

1 of 1  
AS 08/19/79

END
DATE
FILED
7-80
DTIC



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART  
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

ADA 084959

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
	AD-A084959	
4. TITLE (and Subtitle)	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED	
FINDING THE CONTOUR OF A UNION OF ISO-ORIENTED RECTANGLES	(9) Technical Report	
7. AUTHOR(s)	6. PERFORMING ORG./REPORT NUMBER	
Witold Lipski, Jr. ● Franco P. Preparata	R-853 (ACT-16); UILU-ENG 78-2246	
	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)	
	NSF MCS 78-13642	
	DAAG-29-78-C-0016	
	NSF-MCS 78-13642	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS	
Coordinated Science Laboratory University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Urbana, Illinois 61801		
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE	13. NUMBER OF PAGES
Joint Services Electronics Program	Aug 79	18
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)	
(12) 326	UNCLASSIFIED	
	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)		
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
(14) ACT-16, UILU-ENG-78-2246		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
Computational geometry, segment tree, contour, rectangles.		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
<p>→ Let <math>R_1, \dots, R_m</math> be rectangles on the plane with sides parallel to the coordinate axes. An algorithm is described to find the contour of <math>F = R_1 \cup \dots \cup R_m</math> in <math>O(m \log m + p \log(2m^2/p))</math> time, where <math>p</math> is the number of edges in the contour. This is <math>O(m^2)</math> (optimal) in the general case, and <math>O(m \log m)</math> (optimal) when <math>F</math> is without holes (then <math>p \leq 8m-4</math>).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sg. M</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sg. M      L or =</p>		

UILU-ENG 78-2246

FINDING THE CONTOUR OF A UNION OF  
ISO-ORIENTED RECTANGLES

by

Witold Lipski, Jr.  
Franco P. Preparata

This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant NSF MCS 78-13642 and in part by the Joint Services Electronics Program (U.S. Army, U.S. Navy and U.S. Air Force) under Contract DAAG-29-78-C-0016.

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

Approved for public release. Distribution unlimited.

FINDING THE CONTOUR OF A UNION OF ISO-ORIENTED RECTANGLES

Witold Lipski, Jr.\* and Franco P. Preparata

Coordinated Science Laboratory  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
Urbana, IL 61801, USA

Abstract

Let  $R_1, \dots, R_m$  be rectangles on the plane with sides parallel to the coordinate axes. An algorithm is described to find the contour of  $F = R_1 \cup \dots \cup R_m$  in  $O(m \log m + p \log(2m^2/p))$  time, where  $p$  is the number of edges in the contour. This is  $O(m^2)$  (optimal) in the general case, and  $O(m \log m)$  (optimal) when  $F$  is without holes (then  $p \leq 8m-4$ ).

Keywords and phrases: Computational geometry, segment tree, contour, rectangles.

Accession For	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Miss Galt	
DOC TAB	
Unannounced	
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or special
	<b>A</b>

\* On leave from Institute of Computer Science, Polish Academy of Sciences, P. O. Box 22, 00-901 Warsaw PKiN, Poland.

This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant MCS 78-13642 and in part by the Joint Services Electronics Program under Contract DAAG-29-78-C-0016.

## 1. Introduction

In this paper we consider the following geometric problem. Let  $R_1, \dots, R_m$  be rectangles in the plane with sides parallel to the coordinate axes. The union  $F = R_1 \cup \dots \cup R_m$  may consist of one or more disjoint connected components, and each component may or may not have internal holes (note that a hole may contain in its interior some connected components of  $F$ ). The contour (boundary) of  $F$  consists of a collection of disjoint cycles composed of (alternating) vertical and horizontal edges. By convention, any edge is directed in such a way that we have the figure on the left while traversing the edge; this is equivalent to saying that a cycle is oriented clockwise if it is the boundary of a hole, and counterclockwise if it is an external boundary of a connected component. Given  $R_1, \dots, R_m$ , our task is to find the contour of  $F = R_1 \cup \dots \cup R_m$ .

There are several applications which involve iso-oriented rectangles, or, without loss of generality, rectangles whose sides are parallel to the coordinate axes. Suffice it to mention its relevance to Very Large Scale Integration [5], to geography and related areas [3], to computer graphics (hidden-line problems, shadows, etc.), and two-dimensional data organization [6]. There is also considerable theoretical interest in problems related to the one discussed in this paper, such as finding the measure of the union of rectangles [2], testing a set of rectangles for disjointness and reporting all the intersections [4], etc.

## 2. Informal Description of the Algorithm

We informally illustrate the method, with the aid of an example. The algorithm consists of two phases. In the first phase we find the set  $V$  of vertical edges of the contour (edges 1 through 10 in Fig. 1); in the second




Fig. 1. An instance of the problem.

phase we link these vertical edges by means of horizontal edges to form the oriented cycles of the contour.

In order to obtain the set  $V$  we scan the abscissae corresponding to vertical sides of rectangles from left to right. At a generic abscissa  $c$ , the section  $\mathcal{J}$  of the vertical line  $x = c$  with  $F$  is a disjoint union of intervals. This section remains constant between two consecutive vertical sides of the rectangles, and is updated in the scan each time one such side is reached. If  $s$  is a vertical side of some rectangle  $R$  at abscissa  $c$ , the portion of the contour of  $F$  contributed by  $s$  is given by  $s \cap \bar{\mathcal{J}}$  where  $\bar{\mathcal{J}}$  is, as usual, the union of intervals representing the set theoretical complement of  $\mathcal{J}$  on the line  $x = c$  (strictly speaking,  $\mathcal{J}$  should be understood as the section to the left or right of  $x = c$ , depending on whether  $s$  is a left or right side of a rectangle). Storing and updating

of  $\mathcal{J}$ , and an efficient determination of  $s \cap \bar{\mathcal{J}}$  require the use of some nontrivial techniques and data structures and is deferred to the next section. We assume that each of the edges in  $V$  is directed upwards or downwards depending on whether it originates from a left or right side of a rectangle.

We denote by  $(x;b,t)$  a vertical edge of abscissa  $x$  having  $b$  and  $t$  ( $b < t$ ) as its bottom and top ordinates, respectively; similarly,  $(y;l,r)$  represents a horizontal edge of ordinate  $y$  having  $l$  and  $r$  ( $l < r$ ) as its left and right abscissae, respectively.

We shall now describe the second phase of the algorithm. We first augment the set  $V$  by adding triples  $(x;t,b)$  for all  $(x;b,t)$  in  $V$ . Notice that every triple  $(x;y_1,y_2)$  in the resulting set  $V^*$  is in a one-to-one correspondence with a vertex  $(x,y_1)$  of the contour, and that every vertical edge  $(x;b,t)$  of the contour is represented in  $V^*$  exactly twice by triples corresponding to vertices  $(x,b)$  and  $(x,t)$  of the contour. We now sort the triples  $(x;y_1,y_2)$  in  $V^*$  in lexicographic ascending order by  $(y_1,x)$ ; letting  $e_j = (x_j;b_j,t_j)$ , in our example we obtain the sequence:

$(x_2;b_2,t_2)$   $(x_4;b_4,t_4)$   $(x_4;t_4,b_4)$   $(x_9;b_9,t_9)$   $(x_9;t_9,b_9)$   $(x_{10};t_{10},b_{10})$   
 $(x_5;b_5,t_5)$   $(x_7;b_7,t_7)$   $(x_1;b_1,t_1)$   $(x_2;t_2,b_2)$   $(x_5;t_5,b_5)$   $(x_7;t_7,b_7)$   
 $(x_1;t_1,b_1)$   $(x_3;b_3,t_3)$   $(x_6;b_6,t_6)$   $(x_8;b_8,t_8)$   $(x_8;t_8,b_8)$   $(x_{10},t_{10},b_{10})$   
 $(x_3;t_3,b_3)$   $(x_6,t_6,b_6)$ .

In general, let  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p$  ( $p$  even) be the resulting sequence. It is easy to see that the horizontal edges of the contour can now be obtained as the segments joining the vertices represented by  $a_{2k-1}$  and  $a_{2k}$ , for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, p/2$ . More exactly, let  $a_{2k-1} = (l;y,y_1)$ ,  $a_{2k} = (r;y,y_2)$ .

The horizontal edge  $(y;l,r)$  is assigned the direction from left to right if either the edge corresponding to the triple  $(l;y,y_1)$  is directed downwards and  $y < y_1$ , or if  $(l;y,y_1)$  is directed upwards and  $y_1 < y$ ; otherwise we direct  $(y;l,r)$  from right to left. In our example, the pair  $(a_1,a_2) = ((x_2;b_2,t_2),(x_4;b_4,t_4))$ , with  $b_2 = b_4$ , gives rise to the horizontal edge  $(b_2;x_2,x_4)$  which is oriented from left to right because the edge  $e_2$  - corresponding to  $(x_2;b_2,t_2)$  - is directed downwards and  $b_2 < t_2$ ; by contrast the pair  $(a_{17},a_{18}) = ((x_8;t_8,b_8),(x_{10};t_{10},b_{10}))$ , with  $t_8 = t_{10}$  gives rise to the edge  $(t_8;x_8,x_{10})$ , which is directed from right to left because  $e_8$  is directed downwards but  $t_8 \neq b_8$ . It is clear that by a single scan of the sequence  $a_1, \dots, a_p$  we may produce all the horizontal edges and doubly link them into the cycles of the contour, in such a way that the "forward" links determining the orientation of a cycle are consistent with the direction of edges. Then we may find explicitly the cycles of the contour and identify each of them by a vertical edge with the minimal value of abscissa (this can be done in  $O(p)$  time). Notice that a cycle corresponds to the boundary of a hole if this edge is directed upwards, and to an external portion of boundary otherwise.

### 3. Efficient Determination of $s \cap \bar{J}$

In order to efficiently implement the first phase of the algorithm we propose to normalize the ordinates of horizontal edges of rectangles (i.e., to replace each ordinate by its rank in the set of ordinates) and to make use of a segment tree, a data structure introduced by Bentley [2], which we now recall.

Let  $a, b$  be integers with  $a < b$ . The segment tree  $T(a, b)$  is built in the following recursive way. It consists of the root  $v$  with  $B[v] = a$ ,  $E[v] = b$ , and, if  $b - a > 1$ , of a left subtree  $T(a, \lfloor (a+b)/2 \rfloor)$  and right subtree  $T(\lfloor (a+b)/2 \rfloor, b)$ . The roots of these subtrees are pointed to by  $LSON[v]$  and  $RSON[v]$ , respectively. If  $b - a = 1$  then  $LSON[v] = RSON[v] = \Delta$ . In our application we shall use the segment tree  $T(1, h) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} T$ , where  $h \leq 2m$  is the number of distinct ordinates.

As is well-known (see also the procedure INSERT below), an interval  $s = [b, e]$  (with  $1 \leq b < e \leq h$ ), can be subdivided into  $O(\log m)$  segments, each of which equals  $[B[v], E[v]]$ , for some node  $v$  of  $T$ . Thus, for each  $v$  we shall have an integer parameter  $C[v]$ , which denotes the current multiplicity of insertions of segment  $[B[v], E[v]]$  at node  $v$ . We shall also use the parameter  $STATUS[v]$ , which may assume one of three values: full, partial, empty. Intuitively, full denotes that  $C[v] > 0$ , partial denotes that  $C[v] = 0$  but  $C[u] > 0$  for some  $u \neq v$  in the subtree rooted at  $v$ , and empty that  $C[u] = 0$  for every  $u$  in this subtree. In our algorithm we scan the vertical sides of the rectangles from left to right. Each left side is inserted into  $T$  and each right side is deleted from  $T$ , so that the current section  $\mathcal{J}$  is always given by the union of segments  $[B[v], E[v]]$  over all full nodes.

Suppose now that, for some node  $v$  in  $T$ , we have  $s = [b, e] \supseteq [B[v], E[v]]$ . The contribution of  $v$  to  $s \cap \bar{\mathcal{J}}$ , denoted as  $\text{compl}(v)$  is given by

$$\text{compl}(v) = [B[v], E[v]] \cap \bar{\mathcal{J}} = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } STATUS[v] = \text{full} \\ \text{compl}(LSON[v]) \cup \text{compl}(RSON[v]) & \text{if } STATUS[v] = \text{partial} \\ [B[v], E[v]] & \text{if } STATUS[v] = \text{empty.} \end{cases}$$

It appears therefore that  $s \cap \bar{J}$  can be obtained as  $\bigcup_{v \in U} \text{compl}(v)$ , where  $U$  is the set of  $O(\log m)$  nodes of  $T$  corresponding to the segmentation of  $s$ . Notice that  $s \cap \bar{J}$  may consist of several disjoint segments, and that any such segment is obtained as a collection of contiguous intervals (corresponding to a collection of  $O(\log m)$  empty nodes of  $T$ ). To insure that each contour edge be produced as a single item, contiguous intervals have to be merged. To implement this, the edges of  $s \cap \bar{J}$  are assembled in a STACK corresponding to a bottom-to-top scan. At the top of STACK there is always the upper extreme of the last inserted edge (or initial portion of this edge); if the lower extreme of the next segment to be added to STACK coincides with the top of STACK, then the latter is deleted from STACK prior to adding to it the upper extreme of the next segment, thereby realizing the desired merges.

In summary, an interval  $s = [b, e]$  is inserted into  $T$  by the operation  $\text{INSERT}(b, e, \text{root}(T))$ , where  $\text{INSERT}(b, e, v)$  is the following recursive procedure:

```

1  procedure INSERT(b,e,v)
   (*insert segment [b,e] at node v of segment tree*)
2  begin
3    if (b ≤ B[v]) and (E[v] ≤ e) then
4      begin COMPL(v) (*see below*)
5        C[v] := C[v] + 1
6      end
7    else begin if b < ⌊(B[v] + E[v])/2⌋ then INSERT(b,e,LSON[v])
8      if ⌊(B[v] + E[v])/2⌋ < e then INSERT(b,e,RSON[v])
9    end
   (*STATUS[v] is to be updated*)
10 if C[v] > 0 then STATUS[v] := full
11 else if LSON[v] = Λ then STATUS[v] := empty (*v is a leaf*)
12 else if STATUS[LSON[v]] = STATUS[RSON[v]] = empty then STATUS[v] = empty
13 else STATUS[v] := partial
14 end

```

We finally give the procedure COMPL(v):

```

1  procedure COMPL(v)
   (*this procedure makes use of a STACK, which is external to it;
   it pushes on STACK a sequence of segments representing the set
   compl(v)*)
2  begin
3     if STATUS[v] = empty then (*compl(v) = [B[v],E[v]]*)
4     begin if B[v] = top(STACK) then delete top(STACK) (*contiguous
   segments are merged*)
5     else STACK = B[v] (*beginning of edge*)
6     STACK = E[v] (*current termination of edge*)
7     end
8     else if STATUS[v] = partial then
9     begin COMPL(LSON[v])
10    COMPL(RSON[v])
11    end
12 end

```

As mentioned before, a collection of vertical contour edges is generated either in correspondence to a rectangle left side (to be inserted into T) or to a right side (to be deleted from T). The procedure DELETE(e,b,v) is analogous to INSERT(e,b,v). The only difference is that in lines 4 and 5 of DELETE we have  $C[v] := C[v]-1$  and COMPL(v), respectively (reversal of the order of updating C[v] and calling COMPL(v) reflects the fact that for a right side the  $\mathcal{J}$  in  $s \cap \bar{\mathcal{J}}$  is understood as the section to the right of the current abscissa).

Notice that in order to guarantee the correctness of our algorithm we should process, for any value of x, first all left sides (x;b,t) in increasing order of b, and then all right sides in increasing order of b.

#### 4. Performance Analysis

We shall now give a concise description of the algorithm. Each  $R_i$  is represented by a quadruple  $(l_i, r_i, b_i, t_i)$ , where  $l_i < r_i$ ,  $b_i < t_i$  and  $R_i = [l_i, r_i] \times [b_i, t_i]$ .

Step 1: Form the sets (without repetitions)

$A = \{l_i : 1 \leq i \leq m\} \cup \{r_i : 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ ,  $B = \{b_i : 1 \leq i \leq m\} \cup \{t_i : 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ , and sort each of them. From now on we shall identify any  $l_i$  or  $r_i$  with

its rank in the first ordering, and any  $b_i$  or  $t_i$  with its rank in the second ordering. (Comment: In this way we transformed our problem into an equivalent one with  $l_i, r_i \in \{1, \dots, |A|\}$ ,  $b_i, t_i \in \{1, \dots, |B|\}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . Notice that  $|A|, |B| \leq 2m$ , and that all sorting operations are now doable in  $O(m)$  time by standard bucket sorting (see e.g. [1]). The complexity of this step is clearly  $O(m \log m)$ ).

Step 2: Construct the segment tree  $T$ . (Comment: This requires  $O(m)$  steps.)

Step 3: Sort the set (representing all vertical sides of rectangles)

$$S = \{(l_i, \text{left}, b_i, t_i) : 1 \leq i \leq m\} \cup \{(r_i, \text{right}, b_i, t_i) : 1 \leq i \leq m\}$$

lexicographically by all four coordinates (assuming  $\text{left} < \text{right}$ ) and put the sorted sequence in QUEUE. (Comment: This can be done in  $O(m)$  time.)

Step 4: Scan the vertical sides of rectangles listed in QUEUE. Any such side is inserted (by calling INSERT) into the segment tree  $T$  if it is a left side, or deleted (by calling DELETE) from  $T$  if it is a right side. Each of these operations contributes a sequence of edges, placed in STACK, which has to be emptied (outputted) each time we pass either to the next value of abscissa, or from left to right sides with the same abscissa (this is necessary in order to avoid incorrect merging of edges). (Comment: The performance analysis of this step will be done below.)

Step 5: Find the contour cycles. (Comment: This part of the algorithm has been described in detail in Section 2 and shown to run in time  $O(p)$ , where  $p$  is the number of contour edges.)

To analyze Step 4 we shall restrict ourselves to calls of INSERT; calls of DELETE can be handled in a similar way. The work done by INSERT

is best analyzed by recalling an interesting property of segment trees. For any segment  $[b,e]$ , let  $l(b,e)$  be the node  $u$  of  $T$  with  $B[u] = b$  and with the maximum possible  $E[u] \leq e$  (i.e.,  $[B[u],E[u]]$  is the left-most piece in the segmentation of  $[b,e]$ ); similarly, let  $r(b,e)$  be the node  $u$  with  $E[u] = e$  and the minimum possible  $B[u] \geq b$ . Denote by  $P_l$  and  $P_r$  the (sets of nodes of the) paths from the root to  $l(b,e)$  and  $r(b,e)$ , respectively. It is easily seen that the segmentation of  $[b,e]$  is given by  $l(b,e)$ ,  $r(b,e)$ , and the right sons of  $P_l \setminus P_r$  not in  $P_l$  as well as the left sons of  $P_r \setminus P_l$  not in  $P_r$ . Since  $T$  is a nearly balanced tree, the length of each of its paths is bounded by  $\lceil \log m \rceil$ ; thus the work done by a single call of  $\text{INSERT}(b,e,\text{root}(T))$  - disregarding the calls of  $\text{COMPL}$  - is  $O(\log m)$ , since it corresponds to traversing  $P_l \cup P_r$  and spending a fixed amount of work at each node and possibly at its sibling.

Now we shall extend the analysis to account for the work done by  $\text{COMPL}$ .

Let  $(x;b,t)$  be the rectangle side being inserted into the segment tree.

Let  $[b,t] \cap \bar{J} = [c_1,c_2] \cup \dots \cup [c_{2k-1},c_{2k}]$ ,  $c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_{2k}$ , let  $v_{2j-1} = l(c_{2j-1},c_{2j})$ ,  $v_{2j} = r(c_{2j-1},c_{2j})$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq k$ , and let  $P(v_i)$  be the path from  $v_i$  to the root of  $T$ . It is easy to see that what the recursive procedure  $\text{INSERT}$  does, together with  $\text{COMPL}$ , is exactly the preorder traversal of the subtree with node set  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{2k} P(v_i)$ . A fixed amount of work is done at each node visited, and possibly at its sibling, so that the total work is proportional to  $\left| \bigcup_{i=1}^{2k} P(v_i) \right|$ . In order to estimate the latter quantity we shall need the following lemma, proved in Appendix A:

Lemma 1. Let  $T$  be a binary tree with  $N$  leaves. Assume that  $T$  is balanced so that any path from the root to a leaf is of length  $\lfloor \log N \rfloor$  or  $\lceil \log N \rceil$ . Let  $L$  be a subset of nodes of  $T$ , and for every  $u \in L$  denote by  $P(u)$  the set of nodes on the path from  $u$  to the root. Then

$$\left| \bigcup_{u \in L} P(u) \right| < |L| \log \frac{16N}{|L|}.$$

Let us denote by  $n_i$  the number of disjoint pieces in  $s_i \cap \bar{J}$ , where  $s_i$  is the  $i$ -th rectangle side processed in the segment tree ( $1 \leq i \leq 2m$ ). By our lemma applied to the segment tree (note that each of the disjoint segments  $[b, e]$  in  $s_i \cap \bar{J}$  contributes at most two members of set  $L$ , namely  $l(b, e)$  and  $r(b, e)$ , the work involved in processing  $s_i$  can be upperbounded by  $C n_i \log \frac{16m}{n_i}$  for some constant  $C$  (this expression is interpreted as 0 for  $n_i = 0$ ). Summing it over all  $i$ , the global work in Step 4 is upperbounded by

$$C \sum_{i=1}^{2m} n_i \log \frac{16m}{n_i} \leq C p \log \frac{64m^2}{p},$$

where use has been made of the fact that  $\sum n_i$  does not exceed  $p/2$ , the number of vertical edges of the contour (strictly speaking, in the presence of overlapping vertical rectangle sides we should write  $\sum n_i \leq p/2 + 2m$ ; however, this does not affect the asymptotic complexity of the algorithm). It is easy to see that  $p \leq m^2 + 4m$ , so that  $C p \log(64m^2/p) = O(p \log(2m^2/p))$ . Putting this together with the previous comments on Steps 1, 2, 3 and 5 of the algorithm, we obtain Theorem 2. The algorithm correctly finds the  $p$ -edge contour of a union of  $m$  rectangles in time  $O(m \log m + p \log(2m^2/p))$ .

Notice that  $p \log(2m^2/p)$  is increasing in  $p$  in the range  $[4, m^2 + 4m]$ , for  $m > 4$ . This means that if  $m$  is the only measure of the size of the input

then the complexity of our algorithm can be written as  $O(m \log m + (m^2 + 4m) \log(2m^2 / (m^2 + 4m))) = O(m^2)$ , which is clearly optimal (the algorithm for the same problem in [6] is of complexity  $O(m^2 \log m)$ ).

Suppose now that  $F$  has no holes. For this case we prove in Appendix B the following lemma:

Lemma 3. Let  $F = R_1 \cup \dots \cup R_m$  be without holes, and suppose it is composed of  $k$  disjoint connected components. Denote by  $p$  the number of edges in the contour of  $F$ . Then  $p \leq 8m - 4k$ .

Therefore, in the absence of holes, the algorithm runs in time  $O(m \log m + 8m \log(2m^2/p)) = O(m \log m)$ . We shall now prove that this is optimal, using as a computation model the RAM extended with real-number arithmetic.

Theorem 4. The complexity of finding a contour of  $F = R_1 \cup \dots \cup R_m$ , where  $F$  is without holes, is  $\Omega(m \log m)$ .

Proof. We shall show that sorting of  $m$  numbers  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  reduces in  $O(m)$  time to our problem. Indeed, given  $x_i$ , let  $R_i$  be the cartesian product of the  $x$ -interval  $[0, x_i]$  and of the  $y$ -interval  $[0, M - x_i]$ , where  $M = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} x_i + 1$  (see Fig. 2; without loss of generality we assume  $x_1, \dots, x_m > 0$ ). It is clear that  $F = R_1 \cup \dots \cup R_m$  is without holes and that from the contour of  $F$  we can obtain the sorted sequence of the  $x_i$  in  $O(m)$  time.  $\square$




Fig. 2. Reducing sorting to finding the contour of hole-free union of rectangles.

Finally let us note that our algorithm requires  $O(m+p)$  storage.

It is an interesting open problem whether it can be implemented in  $O(m \log m + p)$  time.

Appendix A.

Proof of Lemma 1. It is clear that we may restrict ourselves to the case where  $L$  is a set of leaves of the tree. Let  $T(L)$  be the tree consisting of the nodes in  $\bigcup_{u \in L} P(u)$ , and let  $T_0(L)$  be its subtree consisting of the root of  $T$  and those nodes  $v$  for which the father of  $v$  (or  $v$  itself) has at least two descendants in  $L$  (see Fig. 3).




Fig. 3. To the proof of Lemma 1.

It is easy to see that  $T_0(L)$  is a tree with  $|L|$  leaves. It is also clear that  $|T(L)|$  is maximum (for a fixed  $|L|$ ) if  $T_0(L)$  is a balanced top-most part of  $T$ , with  $|L|$  leaves and  $2|L|-1$  nodes. In such an extremal case

$$\begin{aligned} |T(L)| &\leq 2|L|-1 + |L|(\lceil \log N \rceil - \lfloor \log |L| \rfloor) \\ &< |L|(2 + \log N + 1 - \log |L| + 1) = |L| \log \frac{16N}{|L|} . \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Appendix B

Proof of Lemma 3. We use induction on  $m$ . Our lemma is clearly true for  $m = 1$ . Now suppose it is true for some  $m \geq 1$ , and consider rectangles  $R_i = (l_i, r_i, b_i, t_i)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m+1$ , where  $F^* = R_1 \cup \dots \cup R_m \cup R_{m+1}$  is without holes. Without loss of generality we may assume that the rectangles are labelled so that  $l_i \leq l_{m+1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . It is easy to see that  $F = R_1 \cup \dots \cup R_m$  is without holes. Indeed  $R_{m+1}$  cannot fill a hole in  $F$ , because  $R_{m+1}$  lies entirely to the right of any hole in  $F$ . Suppose  $F$  consists of  $k$  connected parts, and  $R_{m+1}$  "glues together"  $q$  parts of  $F$ . Notice that it necessarily means that the intersection of the left side of  $R_{m+1}$  with  $F$  consists of  $q$  disjoint segments. It is easy to see that the increase of the number of edges in the contour caused by adding  $R_{m+1}$  may come from the following sources (see Fig. 4).




Fig. 4. Adding rectangle  $R_{m+1}$  to  $F = R_1 \cup \dots \cup R_m$ .

(a) segments between the $q$ disjoint segments on the left side of $R_{m+1}$ :	at most $q+1$
(b) similar segments on the right side of $R_{m+1}$ :	at most $q+1$
(c) bottom and top side of $R_{m+1}$ :	at most 2
(d) doubling the edges of the contour of $F$ which intersect both the left and right side of $R_{m+1}$ :	at most $2q$
TOTAL	at most $4q+4$

Taking into account that the number of connected components of  $F^*$  is equal to  $k^* = k - q + 1$ , and using the inductive assumption, we obtain the following estimate on the number of edges in the contour of  $F$ :

$$p^* \leq (8m - 4k) + (4q + 4) = 8(m + 1) - 4(k - q + 1) = 8(m + 1) - 4k^*.$$

□

Notice that there exist hole-free unions of  $m$  rectangles with  $p = 8m - 4k$ , for any  $m$  and any  $1 \leq k \leq m$ . Every connected part of such a union is of the form shown in Fig. 5.




Fig. 5. A hole-free connected union of rectangles with  $p = 8m - 4$ .

References

1. A. V. Aho, J. E. Hopcroft, and J. D. Ullman, The Design and Analysis of Computer Algorithms. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass. 1974.
2. J. L. Bentley, Solutions to Klee's rectangle problems. Unpublished notes, Carnegie-Mellon University, 1977.
3. J. L. Bentley and M. I. Shamos, Optimal algorithms for structuring geographic data. Proc. Symp. on Topological Data Structures for Geographic Information Systems, Harvard, Mass. 1977, pp. 43-51.
4. J. L. Bentley and D. Wood, An optimal worst-case algorithm for reporting intersections of rectangles. Carnegie-Mellon University, 1979.
5. U. Lauther, 4-Dimensional binary search trees as a means to speed up associative searches in design rule verification of integrated circuits. Journal of Design Automation and Fault-Tolerant Computing 2, 1978, pp. 241-247.
6. E. Lodi, F. Luccio, C. Mugnai, and L. Pagli, On two dimensional data organization I. Fundamenta Informaticae, to appear.