

Sketched MinDist

Jeff M. Phillips
University of Utah
jeffp@cs.utah.edu

Pingfan Tang
University of Utah
tang1984@cs.utah.edu

November 25, 2021

Abstract

We sketch vectors of geometric objects J through the MinDist function

$$v_i(J) = \inf_{p \in J} \|p - q_i\|$$

for $q_i \in Q$ from a point set Q . Collecting the vector of these sketch values induces a simple, effective, and powerful distance: the Euclidean distance between these sketched vectors. This paper shows how large this set Q needs to be under a variety of shapes and scenarios. For hyperplanes we provide direct connection to the sensitivity sampling framework, so relative error can be preserved in d dimensions using $Q = O(d/\varepsilon^2)$. However, for other shapes, we show we need to enforce a minimum distance parameter ρ , and a domain size L . For $d = 2$ the sample size Q then can be $\tilde{O}((L/\rho) \cdot 1/\varepsilon^2)$. For objects (e.g., trajectories) with at most k pieces this can provide stronger *for all* approximations with $\tilde{O}((L/\rho) \cdot k^3/\varepsilon^2)$ points. Moreover, with similar size bounds and restrictions, such trajectories can be reconstructed exactly using only these sketch vectors.

1 Introduction

In this paper (and a more empirically-focused companion paper [27]) we introduce a new distance between geometric objects, \mathbf{d}_Q . For an object $J \in \mathcal{J}$, where $J \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, this depends on a set of *landmarks* $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$; for now let $n = |Q|$. These landmarks induce a *sketched representation* $v_Q(J) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ where the i th coordinate $v_i(J)$ is defined via a MinDist operation

$$v_i(J) = \inf_{p \in J} \|p - q_i\|,$$

using the i th landmark $q_i \in Q$. When the object J is implicit, we simply use v_i . Then our new distance \mathbf{d}_Q between two objects $J_1, J_2 \in \mathcal{J}$ is simply the (normalized) Euclidean distance between the sketched representations

$$\mathbf{d}_Q(J_1, J_2) = \|\bar{v}_Q(J_1) - \bar{v}_Q(J_2)\|,$$

where $\bar{v}_Q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|Q|}}v_Q$.

Our companion paper introduces other variants of this distance (using other norms or using the $\arg \min_{p \in J}$ points on each $J \in \mathcal{J}$). We focus on this version as it is the simplest, cleanest, easiest to use, and was the best or competitive with the best on all empirical tasks. Indeed, for the pressing case of measuring a distance between trajectories, this new distance measure dominates a dozen other distance measures (including dynamic time warping, discrete Frechet distance, edit distance for real sequences) in terms of classification performance, and is considerably more efficient in clustering and nearest neighbor tasks.

The goal of this paper is to formally understand how many landmarks in Q are needed for various error guarantees, and how to chose the locations of these points Q .

Our aims in the choice of Q are two-fold: first, we would like to approximate \mathbf{d}_Q with $\mathbf{d}_{\tilde{Q}}$, and second we would like to recover $J \in \mathcal{J}$ exactly only using $v_Q(J)$. The specific results vary depending on the initial set Q and the object class \mathcal{J} . More precisely, the approximation goal aims to preserve d_Q for all objects J in some class \mathcal{J} with a subset $\tilde{Q} \subset Q$ of landmarks. Or possibly a weighted set of landmarks W, \tilde{Q} with $|\tilde{Q}| = N$, so each q_i is associated with a weight w_i and the weighted distance is defined

$$\mathbf{d}_{\tilde{Q}, W}(J_1, J_2) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i \cdot (v_i(J_1) - v_i(J_2))^2} = \|\tilde{v}_{\tilde{Q}}(J_1) - \tilde{v}_{\tilde{Q}}(J_2)\|.$$

where $\tilde{v}_{\tilde{Q}} = (\tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_N)$ with $\tilde{v}_i = \sqrt{w_i}v_i$. Specifically, our aim is an $(\rho, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -*approximation of Q over \mathcal{J}* so when W, \tilde{Q} is selected by a random process that succeeds with probability at least $1 - \delta$, then for a *pair* $J_1, J_2 \in \mathcal{J}$ with $\mathbf{d}_Q(J_1, J_2) \geq \rho$

$$(1 - \varepsilon)\mathbf{d}_Q(J_1, J_2) \leq \mathbf{d}_{\tilde{Q}, W}(J_1, J_2) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\mathbf{d}_Q(J_1, J_2).$$

When this holds for *all* pairs in \mathcal{J} , we say it is a *strong $(\rho, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -approximation of Q over \mathcal{J}* . In some cases we can set to 0 either δ (the process is deterministic) or ρ (this preserves even arbitrarily small distances), and may be able to use uniform weights $w_i = \frac{1}{|\tilde{Q}|}$ for all selected points.

1.1 Our Results

We begin with a special signed variant of the distance associated with the class \mathcal{J} of $(d - 1)$ -dimensional hyperplanes (which for instance could model linear separators or linear regression models). The signed variant provides $v_i(J)$ a negative value on one side of the separator. In this variant, we show that if Q is full rank, then we can recover J from $v_Q(J)$, and a variant of sensitivity sampling can be used to select $O(d/(\delta\varepsilon^2))$ points to provide a $(0, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -approximation W, \tilde{Q} . Or by selecting $O(\frac{d}{\varepsilon^2}(d \log d + \log \frac{1}{\delta}))$ results in a strong $O(0, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -approximation (Theorem 2.2).

Next we consider the more general case where the objects are bounded geometric objects \mathcal{S} . For such objects it is useful to consider a bounded domain $\Omega_L = [0, L]^d$ (for d a fixed constant), and consider the

case where each $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and landmarks satisfy $S, Q \subset \Omega_L$. In this case, the number of samples required for a $(\rho, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -approximation is $\mathfrak{S}_Q \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 \delta}$ where

$$\mathfrak{S}_Q = O \left(\left(\frac{L}{\rho} \right)^{\frac{2d}{2+d}} \min \left(\log \frac{L}{\eta}, \log n, \left(\frac{L}{\rho} \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{2}{2+d}} \right), \quad (1.1)$$

where $\eta = \min_{q, q' \in Q} \|q - q'\|_\infty$. A few special cases are worth expanding upon. When Q is continuous and uniform over Ω_L then $\mathfrak{S}_Q = O((L/\rho)^{\frac{2d}{2+d}})$, and this is tight in \mathbb{R}^2 at $\mathfrak{S}_Q = \Theta(L/\rho)$. That is, we can show that $\mathfrak{S}_Q = \Theta(L/\rho)$ may be needed in general. When $d = 2$ but not necessarily uniform on Ω_L , then $\mathfrak{S}_Q = O(\frac{L}{\rho} \min\{\sqrt{\log n}, L/\rho\})$. And when Q is on a grid over Ω_L in \mathbb{R}^2 of resolution $\Theta(\rho)$, then $\mathfrak{S}_Q = O(\frac{L}{\rho} \sqrt{\log \frac{L}{\rho}})$, just a $\sqrt{\log L/\rho}$ more than the lower bound.

We conclude with some specific results for trajectories. When considering the class \mathcal{T}_k with at most k segments, then $O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \mathfrak{S}_Q (k^3 \log \mathfrak{S}_Q + \log \frac{1}{\delta}))$ samples is sufficient for a *strong* $(\rho, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -approximation. Then when considering trajectories \mathcal{T}_τ where the critical points are at distance at least τ apart from any non-adjacent part of the curve, we can exactly reconstruct the trajectory from v_Q as long as Q is a grid of side length $\Omega(\tau)$. It is much cleaner to describe the results for trajectories and Q precisely on a grid, but these results should extend for any object with k piecewise-linear boundaries, and critical points sufficiently separated, or Q as having any point in each sufficiently dense grid cell, as opposed exactly on the grid lattice.

1.2 Connections to other Domains, and Core Challenges

Before deriving these results, it is useful to lay out the connection to related techniques, including ones that our results will build on, and the challenges in applying them.

Sensitivity sampling. Sensitivity sampling [21, 15, 17, 29] is an important technique for our results. This typically considers a dataset X (a subset of a metric space), endowed with a measure $\mu : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, and a family of cost functions F . These cost functions are usually related to the fitting of a data model or a shape S to X , and for instance on a single point $x \in X$, for $f \in F$, where

$$f(x) = \inf_{p \in S} \|x - p\|^2$$

is the squared distance from x to the closest point p on the shape S . And then $\bar{f} = \int_X f(x) d\mu(x)$. The *sensitivity* [21] of $x \in X$ w.r.t. (F, X, μ) is defined as:

$$\sigma_{F, X, \mu}(x) := \sup_{f \in F} \frac{f(x)}{\bar{f}},$$

and the *total sensitivity* of F is defined as: $\mathfrak{S}(F) = \int_X \sigma_{F, X, \mu}(x) d\mu(x)$. This concept is quite general, and has been widely used in applications ranging from various forms of clustering [15, 17] to dimensionality reduction [16] to shape-fitting [29]. In particular, this will allow us to draw N samples \tilde{X} iid from X proportional to $\sigma_{F, X, \mu}(x)$, and weighted $\tilde{w}(\tilde{x}) = \frac{\mathfrak{S}(F)}{N \cdot \sigma_{F, X, \mu}(\tilde{x})}$; we call this $\sigma_{F, X, \mu}$ -*sensitive sampling*. Then \tilde{X} is a $(0, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -coreset; that is, with probability $1 - \delta$ for *each* $f \in F$

$$(1 - \varepsilon) \bar{f} \leq \int_{\tilde{X}} f(\tilde{x}) d\tilde{w}(\tilde{x}) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \bar{f},$$

using $N = O(\frac{\mathfrak{S}(F)}{\varepsilon^2 \delta})$ [21]. The same error bound holds for *all* $f \in F$ (then it is called a $(0, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -*strong coreset*) with $N = O(\frac{\mathfrak{S}(F)}{\varepsilon^2} (\mathfrak{s}_F \log \mathfrak{S}(F) + \log \frac{1}{\delta}))$ where \mathfrak{s}_F is the shattering dimension of the range space $(X, \text{ranges}(F))$ [4]. Specifically, each range $r \in (X, \text{ranges}(F))$ is defined as those points in a sublevel set of a specific cost function $r = \{x \in X \mid \frac{\mu(x)}{\mathfrak{S}(F)} \frac{f(x)}{\bar{f}} \leq \xi\}$ for some $f \in F$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$.

It seems natural that a form of our results would follow directly from these approaches. However, two significant and intertwined challenges remain. First, our goal is to approximate the distance between a pair of sketches $\|v_Q(J_1) - v_Q(J_2)\|$, where these results effectively only preserve the norm of a single sketch $\|v_Q(J_1)\|$;

this prohibits many of the geometric arguments in the prior work on this subject. Second, the total sensitivity $\mathfrak{S}(F)$ associated with unrestricted Q and pairs $J_1, J_2 \in \mathcal{J}$ is in general unbounded (as we prove in Lemma 3.1). Indeed, if the total sensitivity was bounded, it would imply a mapping to bounded vector space [21], wherein the subtraction of the two sketches $v_Q(J_1) - v_Q(J_2)$ would still be an element of this space, and the norm bound would be sufficient.

We circumvent these challenges in two ways. First, we identify a special case in Section 2 (with negative distances, for hyperplanes) under which there is a mapping of the sketch $v_Q(J_1)$ to metric space independent of the size and structure of Q . This induces a bound for total sensitivity related to a single object, and allows the subtraction of two sketches to be handled within the same framework.

Second, we enforce a lower bound on the distance $\mathfrak{d}_Q(J_1, J_2) > \rho$ and an upper bound on the domain $\Omega_L = [0, L]^d$. This induces a restricted class of pairs $\mathcal{J}_{L/\rho}$ where L/ρ is a scaleless parameter, and it shows up in bounds we are then able to produce for the total sensitivity with respect to $\mathcal{J}_{L/\rho}$ and $Q \subset \Omega_L$.

Leverage scores, and large scales. Let $(\cdot)^+$ denotes the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of a matrix, so $(AA^T)^+ = (AA^T)^{-1}$ when AA^T is full rank. The *leverage score* [13] of the i th column a_i of matrix A is defined as: $\tau_i(A) := a_i^T (AA^T)^+ a_i$. This definition is more specific and linear-algebraic than sensitivity, but has received more attention for scalable algorithm development and approximation [13, 3, 12, 9, 25, 10].

However, Theorem B.1 (in the Appendix B.1) shows that if F is the collection of some functions defined on a set Q of n points ($\mu(q_i) = \frac{1}{n}$ for all $q_i \in Q$), where each $f \in F$ is the square of some function v in a finite dimensional space V spanned by a basis $\{v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(\kappa)}\}$, then we can build a $\kappa \times n$ matrix A where the i th column is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(v^{(1)}(q_i), \dots, v^{(\kappa)}(q_i))^T$, and have $\frac{1}{n} \cdot \sigma_{F,Q,\mu}(q_i)$ is precisely the leverage score of the i th column of the matrix A . A similar observation has been made by Varadarajan and Xiao [29].

A concrete implication of this connection is that we can invoke an online row sampling algorithm of Cohen *et al.* [10]. In our context, this algorithm would stream over Q , maintaining (ridge) estimates of the sensitivity of each q_i from a sample \tilde{Q}_{i-1} , and retaining each q_i in that sample based on this estimate. Even in this streaming setting, this provides an approximation bound not much weaker than the sampling or gridding bounds we present; see Appendix B.1.

Connection from MinDist to shape reconstruction. The fields of computational topology and surface modeling have extensively explored [5, 28, 6] the distance function to a compact set $J \subset \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\mathfrak{d}_J(x) = \inf_{p \in J} \|x - p\|,$$

their approximations, and the offsets $J^r = \mathfrak{d}_J^{-1}([0, r])$. For instance the Hausdorff distance between two compact sets J, J' is $\mathfrak{d}_H(J, J') = \|\mathfrak{d}_J - \mathfrak{d}_{J'}\|_\infty$. The gradient of \mathfrak{d}_J implies stability properties about the medial axis [7]. And most notably, this stability of \mathfrak{d}_J with respect to a sample $P \sim J$ or $P \sim \partial J$ is closely tied to the development of shape reconstruction (aka geometric and topological inference) through α -shapes [14], power crust [1], and the like. The intuitive formulation of this problem through \mathfrak{d}_J (as opposed to Voronoi diagrams of P) has led to more statistically robust variants [6, 28] which also provide guarantees in shape recovery up to small feature size [18], essentially depending on the maximum curvature of ∂J .

Our formulation flips this around. Instead of considering samples P from J (or ∂J) we consider samples Q from some domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. This leads to new but similar sampling theory, still depending on some feature size (represented by various scale parameters ρ, τ , and η), and still allowing recovery properties of the underlying objects. While the samples P from J can be used to estimate Hausdorff distance via an all-pairs $O(|P|^2)$ -time comparison, our formulation requires only a $O(|Q|)$ -time comparison to compute \mathfrak{d}_Q . We leave as open questions the recovering of topological information about an object $J \in \mathcal{J}$ from $v_Q(J)$.

Function space sketching. While most geometric inference sampling bounds focus on low-level geometric parameters (e.g., weak local feature size, etc), a variant based on the kernel distance $\mathfrak{d}_K(P, x)$ [28] can be approximated (including useful level sets) using a uniform sample $P' \sim P$. The kernel distance in this setting is defined $\mathfrak{d}_K(P, x) = \sqrt{1 + \mu_K(P) - 2\text{KDE}_P(x)}$ where the kernel density estimate is defined $\text{KDE}_P(x) = \frac{1}{|P|} \sum_{p \in P} K(p, x)$ with $K(p, x) = \exp(-\|x - p\|^2)$ and $\mu_K(P) = \frac{1}{P} \sum_{p \in P} \text{KDE}_P(p)$. This sampling mechanism can be used to analyze KDE_P (and thus also \mathfrak{d}_K) [24] by considering a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) \mathcal{H}_K associated with K ; this is a function space so each element $\phi_K(p) = K(p, \cdot) \in \mathcal{H}_K$ is a function. And averages $\Phi_K(P) = \frac{1}{P} \sum_{p \in P} \phi_K(p) = \text{KDE}_P$ are kernel density estimates. Ultimately,

$O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \log \frac{1}{\delta})$ samples \tilde{P} yields [22] with probability $1 - \delta$ that $\|\Phi_K(P) - \Phi_K(\tilde{P})\|_{\mathcal{H}_K} \leq \varepsilon$ which implies $\|\text{KDE}_P - \text{KDE}_{\tilde{P}}\|_{\infty} \leq \varepsilon$, and hence also $\|\mathbf{d}_K(P, \cdot) - \mathbf{d}_K(\tilde{P}, \cdot)\|_{\infty} \leq \Theta(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$. Notably, the natural \mathcal{H}_K -norm is an ℓ_2 -norm when restricted to any finite dimensional subspace (e.g., the basis defined by $\{\phi_K(p)\}_{p \in P}$).

Similarly, our approximations of $\mathbf{d}_Q(\cdot, \cdot)$ using a sample $\tilde{Q} \sim Q$ result in a similar function space approximation. Again the main difference is that \mathbf{d}_Q is bivariate (so it takes in a pair $J_1, J_2 \in \mathcal{J}$, which is hard to interpret geometrically), and we seek a relative error (not an additive error). This connection leads us to realize that there are JL-type approximations [20] of this feature space. That is, given a set of t objects $O = J_1, J_2, \dots, J_t \subset \mathcal{J}$, and their representations $v_Q(J_1), v_Q(J_2), \dots, v_Q(J_t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there is a mapping h to \mathbb{R}^N with $N = O((1/\varepsilon^2) \log \frac{t}{\delta})$, so with probability at least $1 - \delta$ so for any pair $J, J' \in O$ $(1 - \varepsilon)\mathbf{d}_Q(J, J') \leq \|h(v_Q(J)) - h(v_Q(J'))\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\mathbf{d}_Q(J, J')$. However, for such a result to hold for *all* pairs in \mathcal{J} , there likely requires a lower bound on the distance ρ and/or upper bound on the underlying space L , as with the kernels [8, 26]. Moreover, such an approach would not provide an explicit coreset \tilde{Q} that is interpretable in the original space \mathbb{R}^d .

2 The Distance Between Two Hyperplanes

In this section, we define a distance \mathbf{d}_Q between two hyperplanes. Let $\mathcal{H} = \{h \mid h \text{ is a hyperplane in } \mathbb{R}^d\}$ represent the space of all hyperplanes.

Suppose $Q = \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, where q_i has the coordinate $(x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \dots, x_{i,d})$. Without specification, in this paper Q is a multiset, which means two points in Q can be at the same location, and $\|\cdot\|$ represents l^2 norm.

Any hyperplane $h \in \mathcal{H}$ can be uniquely expressed in the form

$$h = \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \sum_{j=1}^d u_j x_j + u_{d+1} = 0\},$$

where (u_1, \dots, u_{d+1}) is a vector in $\mathbb{U}^{d+1} := \{u = (u_1, \dots, u_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \mid \sum_{j=1}^d u_j^2 = 1 \text{ and the first nonzero entry of } u \text{ is positive}\}$, i.e. (u_1, \dots, u_d) is the unit normal vector of h , and u_{d+1} is the offset. A sketched halfspace h has n -dimensional vector $v_Q(h) = (v_1(h), \dots, v_n(h))$ where each coordinate v_i is defined as the *signed* distance from q_i to the closest points on h , which can be calculated $v_i(h) = \sum_{j=1}^d u_j x_{i,j} + u_{d+1}$; the dot-product with the unit normal of h , plus offset u_{d+1} . As before, the distance is defined as $\mathbf{d}_Q(h_1, h_2) = \|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(v_Q(h_1) - v_Q(h_2))\|$. When $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is *full rank* – that is, there are $d + 1$ points in Q which are not on a common hyperplane – then our companion paper [27] shows \mathbf{d}_Q is a metric on \mathcal{H} .

2.1 Estimation of \mathbf{d}_Q by Sensitivity Sampling on Q

We use sensitivity sampling to estimate \mathbf{d}_Q with respect to a tuple (F, X, μ) . First suppose $Q = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is full rank and $n \geq d + 1$. Then we can let $X = Q$ and $\mu = \frac{1}{n}$; what remains is to define the appropriate F . Roughly, F is defined with respect to a $(d + 1)$ -dimensional vector space V , where for each $f \in F$, $f = v^2$ for some $v \in V$; and V is the set of all linear functions on $x \in Q$.

We now define F in more detail. Recall each $h \in \mathcal{H}$ can be represented as a vector $u \in \mathbb{U}^{d+1}$. This u defines a function $v_u(q) = \sum_{i=1}^d u_i x_i + u_{d+1}$, and these functions are elements of V . The vector space is however larger and defined

$$V = \{v_a : Q \mapsto \mathbb{R} \mid v_a(q) = \sum_{i=1}^d a_i x_i + a_{d+1} \text{ where } q = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in Q, a = (a_1, \dots, a_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}\},$$

so that there can be $v_a \in V$ for which $a \notin \mathbb{U}^{d+1}$; rather it can more generally be in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . Then the desired family of real-valued functions is defined

$$F = \{f : Q \mapsto [0, \infty) \mid \exists v \in V \text{ s.t. } f(q) = v(q)^2, \forall q \in Q\}.$$

To see how this can be applied to estimate \mathbf{d}_Q , consider two hyperplanes h_1, h_2 in \mathbb{R}^d and the two unique vectors $u^{(1)}, u^{(2)} \in \mathbb{U}^{d+1}$ which represent them. Now introduce the vector $u = (u_1, \dots, u_{d+1}) = u^{(1)} - u^{(2)}$;

note that $u \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, but not necessarily in \mathbb{U}^{d+1} . Now for $q \in Q$ define a function $f_{h_1, h_2} \in F$ as

$$f_{h_1, h_2}(q) = f_{h_1, h_2}(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^d u_i x_i + u_{d+1} \right)^2,$$

so $\mathbf{d}_Q(h_1, h_2) = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{q \in Q} f_{h_1, h_2}(q) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. And thus an estimation of $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{q \in Q} f_{h_1, h_2}(q)$ provides an estimation of $\mathbf{d}_Q(h_1, h_2)$. From Lemma B.1, we know the total sensitivity of F is $d+1$. In particular, given the sensitivities score $\sigma(q)$ for each $q \in Q$, we can invoke [21][Lemma 2.1] to reach the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Consider full rank $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and halfspaces \mathcal{H} with $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$. A σ -sensitive sampling \tilde{Q} of (Q, F) of size $|\tilde{Q}| = \frac{d+1}{\delta \varepsilon^2}$ results in a $(0, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -coreset. And thus an $(0, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -approximation so with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for each pair $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$*

$$(1 - \varepsilon) \mathbf{d}_Q(h_1, h_2) \leq \mathbf{d}_{\tilde{Q}, W}(h_1, h_2) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \mathbf{d}_Q(h_1, h_2).$$

Now, we use the framework in Braverman *et al.* [4] to construct a strong $O(0, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -approximation for Q over \mathcal{H} . In the remaining part of this subsection, we assume Q is a set (not a multiset), each $q \in Q$ has a weight $w(q) \in (0, 1]$, and $\sum_{q \in Q} w(q) = 1$. Recall that for a range space (Q, \mathcal{R}) the shattering dimension $\mathfrak{s} = \dim(Q, \mathcal{R})$ is the smallest integer \mathfrak{s} so that $|\{S \cap R \mid R \in \mathcal{R}\}| \leq |S|^{\mathfrak{s}}$ for all $S \subset Q$. We introduce ranges \mathcal{X} where each range $X_{h_1, h_2, \eta} \in \mathcal{X}$ is defined by two halfspaces $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ and a threshold $\eta > 0$. This is defined with respect to Q and a weighting $w : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, specifically

$$X_{h_1, h_2, \eta} = \{q \in Q \mid w(q) f_{h_1, h_2}(q) \leq \eta\}.$$

Next we use the sensitivity $\sigma : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ to define an adjusted range space (Q, \mathcal{X}') with adjusted weights $w'(q) = \frac{\sigma(q)}{d+1} w(q)$ and adjusted ranges $X'_{h_1, h_2, \eta} \in \mathcal{X}'$ defined using $g_{h_1, h_2}(q) = \frac{1}{\sigma(q)} \frac{f_{h_1, h_2}(q)}{f_{h_1, h_2}}$ as

$$X'_{h_1, h_2, \eta} = \{q \in Q \mid w'(q) g_{h_1, h_2}(q) \leq \eta\}.$$

Recall that $\bar{f}_{h_1, h_2} = \sum_{q \in Q} w(q) f_{h_1, h_2}(q)$. To apply [4][Theorem 5.5] we only need to bound the shattering dimension of the adjusted range space (Q, \mathcal{X}') .

Lemma 2.1. *The shattering dimension of adjusted range space (Q, \mathcal{X}') is bounded by $O(d)$.*

Proof. We start by rewriting any element $X'_{h_1, h_2, \eta}$ of the adjusted range space as

$$\begin{aligned} X'_{h_1, h_2, \eta} &= \{q \in Q \mid w'(q) g_{h_1, h_2}(q) \leq \eta\} \\ &= \{q \in Q \mid w(q) f_{h_1, h_2}(q) \leq \eta(d+1) \bar{f}_{h_1, h_2}\} \\ &= \{q \in Q \mid \sqrt{w(q)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d u_i x_i + u_{d+1} \right) \leq (\eta(d+1) \bar{f}_{h_1, h_2})^{\frac{1}{2}}\} \\ &\quad \cap \{q \in Q \mid -\sqrt{w(q)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d u_i x_i + u_{d+1} \right) \leq (\eta(d+1) \bar{f}_{h_1, h_2})^{\frac{1}{2}}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where (x_1, \dots, x_d) is the coordinates of $q \in Q$. This means each set $X'_{h_1, h_2, \eta} \in \mathcal{X}'$ can be decomposed as the intersection of sets in two ranges over Q from:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_1 &= \left\{ \left\{ q \in Q \mid \sqrt{w(q)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d u_i x_i + u_{d+1} \right) \leq (\eta(d+1) \bar{f}_{h_1, h_2})^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \mid h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}, \eta \geq 0 \right\}, \\ \mathcal{R}_2 &= \left\{ \left\{ q \in Q \mid -\sqrt{w(q)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^d u_i x_i + u_{d+1} \right) \leq (\eta(d+1) \bar{f}_{h_1, h_2})^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \mid h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}, \eta \geq 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.1, we only need to bound the dimension of each associated range space (Q, \mathcal{R}_1) and (Q, \mathcal{R}_2) . We introduce new variables $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}, z = (z_1, \dots, z_{d+1}), c = (c_1, \dots, c_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$:

$$\begin{aligned} z_i &= \sqrt{w(q)} x_i \text{ for } i \in [d], \quad z_{d+1} = \sqrt{w(q)}, \\ c_i &= u_i \text{ for } i \in [d+1], \quad c_0 = -(\eta(d+1) \bar{f}_{h_1, h_2})^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since Q is a fixed set, we know z only depends on q , and c_0, c only depend on h_1, h_2 and η . By introducing new variables we construct an injective map $\varphi : Q \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, s.t. $\varphi(q) = z$. So, there is also an injective map from \mathcal{R}_1 to $\{z \in \varphi(Q) \mid c_0 + \langle z, c \rangle \leq 0\} \mid c_0 \in \mathbb{R}, c \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. Since the shattering dimension of the range space $(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \mathcal{H}^{d+1})$, where $\mathcal{H}^{d+1} = \{h \mid h \text{ is a halfspace in } \mathbb{R}^{d+1}\}$, is $O(d)$, we have $\dim(Q, \mathcal{R}_1) = O(d)$, and similarly $\dim(Q, \mathcal{R}_2) = O(d)$. Thus, we obtain an $O(d)$ bound for the shattering dimension of (Q, \mathcal{X}) . \square

From Lemma 2.1 and [4][Theorem 5.5] we can directly obtain a strong $O(0, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -approximation for Q over \mathcal{H} .

Theorem 2.2. *Consider full rank $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and halfspaces \mathcal{H} with $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$. A σ -sensitive sampling \tilde{Q} of (Q, F) of size $|\tilde{Q}| = O(\frac{d}{\varepsilon^2}(d \log d + \log \frac{1}{\delta}))$ results in a strong $(0, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -coreset. And thus a strong $(0, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -approximation so with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$*

$$(1 - \varepsilon)d_Q(h_1, h_2) \leq d_{\tilde{Q}, W}(h_1, h_2) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)d_Q(h_1, h_2).$$

3 Sketched MinDist for Two Geometric Objects

In this section, we mildly restrict d_Q to the distance between any two geometric objects, in particularly bounded closed sets. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{S \subset \mathbb{R}^d \mid S \text{ is a bounded closed set}\}$ be the space of objects \mathcal{J} we consider.

As before define $v_i(S) = \inf_{p \in S} \|p - q_i\|$, and then for $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ define $f_{S_1, S_2}(q_i) = (v_i(S_1) - v_i(S_2))^2$. The associated function space is $F(\mathcal{S}) = \{f_{S_1, S_2} \mid S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}\}$. Setting $\mu(q) = \frac{1}{n}$ for all $q \in Q$, then $(d_Q(S_1, S_2))^2 = \tilde{f}_{S_1, S_2} := \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(q_i) f_{S_1, S_2}(q_i)$. Using sensitivity sampling to estimate $d_Q(S_1, S_2)$ requires a bound on the total sensitivity of $F(\mathcal{S})$.

In this section we show that while unfortunately the total sensitivity $\mathfrak{S}(F(\mathcal{S}))$ is unbounded in general, it can be tied closely to the ratio L/ρ between the diameter of the domain L , and the minimum allowed d_Q distance between objects ρ . In particular, it can be at least proportional to this, and in \mathbb{R}^2 in most cases (e.g., for near-uniform Q) is at most proportional to L/ρ or not much larger for any Q .

3.1 Lower Bound on Total Sensitivity




Figure 1: Q is the set of blue points, γ_1 is the red curve, γ_2 is the green curve, and they coincide with each other on the boundary of the square.

Suppose Q is a set of n points in \mathbb{R}^2 and no two points are at the same location, then for any $q_0 \in Q$ we can draw two curves γ_1, γ_2 as shown in Figure 1, where γ_1 is composed by five line segments and γ_2 is composed by four line segments. The four line segments of the γ_2 forms a square, on its boundary γ_1 and γ_2 coincide with each other, and inside this square, q_0 is the endpoint of γ_1 . We can make this square small enough, such that all points $q \neq q_0$ are outside this square. So, we have $\text{dist}(q_0, \gamma_1) = 0$ and $\text{dist}(q_0, \gamma_2) \neq 0$, and $\text{dist}(q, \gamma_1) = \text{dist}(q, \gamma_2) = 0$ for all $q \neq q_0$. Thus, we have $f_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}(q_0) > 0$ and $f_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}(q) = 0$ for all $q \neq q_0$, which implies

$$\sigma_{F(\mathcal{S}), Q, \mu}(q_0) \geq \frac{f_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}(q_0)}{f_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}} = \frac{f_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}(q_0)}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{q \in Q} f_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}(q)} = \frac{n f_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}(q_0)}{f_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}(q_0)} = n.$$

Since this construction of two curves γ_1, γ_2 can be repeated around any point $q \in Q$,

$$\mathfrak{S}(F(\mathcal{S})) = \sum_{q \in Q} \mu(q) \sigma_{F(\mathcal{S}), Q, \mu}(q) \geq \sum_{q \in Q} \frac{1}{n} n = n.$$

We can refine this bound by introducing two parameters L, ρ for \mathcal{S} . Given $L > \rho > 0$ and a set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of n points, we define $\mathcal{S}(L) = \{S \in \mathcal{S} \mid S \subset [0, L]^d\}$ and $F(\mathcal{S}(L), \rho) = \{f_{S_1, S_2} \in F(\mathcal{S}) \mid S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}(L), \mathbf{d}_Q(S_1, S_2) \geq \rho\}$. The following lemma gives a lower bound for the total sensitivity of $F(\mathcal{S}(L), \rho)$ in the case $d = 2$, which directly holds for larger d .

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose $d = 2$, then can construct a set $Q \subset [0, L]^d$ such that $\mathfrak{S}(F(\mathcal{S}(L), \rho)) = \Omega(\frac{L}{\rho})$.*

Proof. We uniformly partition $[0, L]^2$ into n grid cells, such that $C_1 \frac{L}{\rho} \leq n \leq C_2 \frac{L}{\rho}$ for constants $C_1, C_2 \in (0, 1)$. The side length of each grid is $\eta = \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}}$. We take Q as the n grid points, and for each point $q \in Q$ we can choose two curves γ_1 and γ_2 (similar to curves in Figure 1) such that $\text{dist}(q, \gamma_1) = 0$, $\text{dist}(q, \gamma_2) \geq C_2 \eta$, and $\text{dist}(q', \gamma_1) = \text{dist}(q', \gamma_2) = 0$ for all $q' \in Q \setminus \{q\}$. Thus, we have $\mathbf{d}_Q(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \geq C_2 \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{n}} = C_2 \frac{L}{n} \geq \rho$. So, $f_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} \in F(\mathcal{S}(L), \rho)$ and we have $\sigma(q) \geq n$ for all $q \in Q$ and $\mathfrak{S}(F(\mathcal{S}(L), \rho)) \geq n \geq C_1 \frac{L}{\rho}$, which implies $\mathfrak{S}(F(\mathcal{S}(L), \rho)) = \Omega(\frac{L}{\rho})$. \square

3.2 Upper Bound on the Total Sensitivity

A simple upper bound of $\mathfrak{S}(F(\mathcal{S}(L), \rho))$ is $O(\frac{L^2}{\rho^2})$ follows from the L/ρ constraint. The sensitivity of each point $q \in Q$ is defined as $\sup_{f_{S_1, S_2} \in F(\mathcal{S}(L), \rho)} \frac{f_{S_1, S_2}(q)}{f_{S_1, S_2}}$, where $f_{S_1, S_2}(q) = O(L^2)$ for all $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}(L)$ and $q \in Q \subset [0, L]^d$, and the denominator $\bar{f}_{S_1, S_2} \geq \rho^2$ by assumption for all $f_{S_1, S_2} \in F(\mathcal{S}(L), \rho)$. Hence, the sensitivity of each point in Q is $O(\frac{L^2}{\rho^2})$, and thus their average, the total sensitivity is $O(\frac{L^2}{\rho^2})$. In this section we will improve and refine this bound.

We introduce two variables only depends on $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\} \subset [0, L]^d$:

$$C_q := \max_{0 < r \leq L} \frac{r^d}{L^d} \frac{n}{|Q \cap B_\infty(q, r)|} \quad \text{for } q \in Q, \text{ and } C_Q := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{q \in Q} C_q^{\frac{2}{2+d}}. \quad (3.1)$$

where $B_\infty(q, r) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|x - q\|_\infty \leq r\}$. Intuitively, $\frac{|Q \cap B_\infty(q, r)|}{r^d}$ is proportional to the point density in region $B_\infty(q, r)$, and the value of $\frac{r^d}{L^d} \frac{n}{|Q \cap B_\infty(q, r)|}$ can be maximized, when the region $B_\infty(q, r)$ has smallest point density, which means r should be as large as possible but the number of points contained in $B_\infty(q, r)$ should be as small as possible. A trivial bound of C_q is n , but if we make $C_{q_0} = n$ for one point q_0 , then it implies the value of C_q for other points will be small, so for C_Q it is possible to obtain a bound better than $n^{\frac{2}{d+2}}$.

Importantly, these quantities C_q and C_Q will be directly related to the sensitivity of a single point $\sigma(q)$ and the total sensitivity of the point set \mathfrak{S}_Q , respectively. We formalize this connection in the next lemma, which for instance implies that for d constant then $\mathfrak{S}_Q = O(C_Q \cdot (L/\rho)^{\frac{2d}{2+d}})$.

Lemma 3.2. *For function family $F(\mathcal{S}(L), \rho)$ the sensitivity for any $q \in Q \in [0, L]^d$ is bounded*

$$\sigma(q) \leq C_d C_q^{\frac{2}{2+d}} \left(\frac{L}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{2d}{2+d}},$$

where $C_d = 4^{\frac{2}{2+d}} (8\sqrt{d})^{\frac{2d}{2+d}}$ and C_q given by (3.1).

Proof. Recall $\sigma(q) = \sup_{f_{S_1, S_2} \in F(\mathcal{S}(L), \rho)} \frac{f_{S_1, S_2}(q)}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{q' \in Q} f_{S_1, S_2}(q')}$. For any fixed $q \in Q$, for now suppose $f_{S_1, S_2} \in F(\mathcal{S}(L), \rho)$ satisfies this supremum $\sigma(q) = \frac{f_{S_1, S_2}(q)}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{q' \in Q} f_{S_1, S_2}(q')}$. We define $\text{dist}(q, S) = \inf_{p \in S} \|q - p\|$ (so for $q_i \in Q$ then $\text{dist}(q_i, S) = v_i(S)$), and then use the parameter $M := |\text{dist}(q, S_1) - \text{dist}(q, S_2)|$, where $M^2 = f_{S_1, S_2}(q)$. If $M = 0$, then obviously $f_{S_1, S_2}(q) = M^2 = 0$, and $\sigma(q) = 0$. So, without loss of generality, we assume $M > 0$ and $\text{dist}(q, S_1) = \tau$ and $\text{dist}(q, S_2) = \tau + M$. We first prove $\sigma(q) \leq C_d C_q \frac{L^d}{M^d}$. There are two cases for the relationship between τ and M , as shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Left: Case 1, $r = \frac{M}{8} \leq \tau$, and $q' \in B(q, r)$. Right: Case 2, $r = \frac{M}{8} > \tau$, and $q' \in B(q, \tau + r)$.

Case 1: $\tau \geq \frac{M}{8}$. For any $q' \in B(q, \frac{M}{8}) := \{q' \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|q' - q\| \leq \frac{M}{8}\}$, we have $\tau + M = \text{dist}(q, S_2) \leq \text{dist}(q, q') + \text{dist}(q', S_2) \leq \frac{M}{8} + \text{dist}(q', S_2)$, which implies for all $q' \in B(q, \frac{M}{8})$

$$\text{dist}(q', S_2) \geq \tau + M - \frac{M}{8} = \tau + \frac{7}{8}M.$$

Similarly $\text{dist}(q', S_1) \leq \text{dist}(q', q) + \text{dist}(q, S_1) \leq \frac{M}{8} + \tau$ for all $q' \in B(q, \frac{M}{8})$. Thus for all $q' \in B(q, \frac{M}{8})$

$$|\text{dist}(q', S_2) - \text{dist}(q', S_1)| \geq \text{dist}(q', S_2) - \text{dist}(q', S_1) \geq \tau + \frac{7}{8}M - (\tau + \frac{M}{8}) = \frac{3}{4}M.$$

Case 2: $0 \leq \tau < \frac{M}{8}$. For any $q' \in B(q, \tau + \frac{M}{8}) := \{q' \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \text{dist}(q', q) \leq \tau + \frac{M}{8}\}$, we have $\tau + M = \text{dist}(q, S_2) \leq \text{dist}(q, q') + \text{dist}(q', S_2) \leq \tau + \frac{M}{8} + \text{dist}(q', S_2)$, which implies for all $q' \in B(q, \tau + \frac{M}{8})$

$$\text{dist}(q', S_2) \geq \frac{7}{8}M.$$

Combined with $\tau < \frac{M}{8}$ and $\text{dist}(q', S_1) \leq \text{dist}(q', q) + \text{dist}(q, S_1) \leq \tau + \frac{M}{8} + \tau = \frac{M}{8} + \frac{M}{8} + \frac{M}{8} \leq \frac{3}{8}M$ for all $q' \in B(q, \tau + \frac{M}{8})$, we have

$$|\text{dist}(q', S_2) - \text{dist}(q', S_1)| \geq \text{dist}(q', S_2) - \text{dist}(q', S_1) \geq \frac{7}{8}M - \frac{3}{8}M = \frac{M}{2}.$$

Combining these two cases on τ , for all $q' \in B(q, \frac{M}{8})$

$$|\text{dist}(q', S_2) - \text{dist}(q', S_1)| \geq \frac{M}{2}.$$

Then since $B_\infty(q, \frac{r}{\sqrt{d}}) \subset B(q, r)$ for all $r \geq 0$, from $C_q = \max_{0 < r \leq L} \frac{r^d}{L^d |Q \cap B_\infty(q, r)|} \geq (\frac{1}{8\sqrt{d}})^d \frac{M^d}{L^d |Q \cap B_\infty(q, \frac{M}{8\sqrt{d}})|}$, we can bound the denominator in $\sigma(q)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{q' \in Q} f_{S_1, S_2}(q') &\geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{q' \in Q \cap B_\infty(q, \frac{M}{8\sqrt{d}})} f_{S_1, S_2}(q') = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{q' \in Q \cap B_\infty(q, \frac{M}{8\sqrt{d}})} (\text{dist}(q', S_1) - \text{dist}(q', S_2))^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{n} M^2 |Q \cap B_\infty(q, \frac{M}{8\sqrt{d}})| \geq \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{8\sqrt{d}}\right)^d \frac{M^2}{C_q} \frac{M^d}{L^d} = \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{8\sqrt{d}}\right)^d \frac{1}{C_q} \frac{M^{2+d}}{L^d}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\sigma(q) = \frac{M^2}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{q' \in Q} f_{S_1, S_2}(q')} \leq 4(8\sqrt{d})^d M^2 C_q \frac{L^d}{M^{2+d}} = 4(8\sqrt{d})^d C_q \frac{L^d}{M^d}.$$

Combining this with $\sigma(q) \leq \frac{M^2}{\rho^2}$, we have $\sigma(q) \leq \min\left(\frac{M^2}{\rho^2}, 4(8\sqrt{d})^d C_q \frac{L^d}{M^d}\right)$. If $M^{2+d} \leq 4(8\sqrt{d})^d C_q \rho^2 L^d$, then $\frac{M^2}{\rho^2} \leq 4(8\sqrt{d})^d C_q \frac{L^d}{M^d}$, which means $\sigma(q) \leq \min\left(\frac{M^2}{\rho^2}, 4(8\sqrt{d})^d C_q \frac{L^d}{M^d}\right) = \frac{M^2}{\rho^2} \leq 4^{\frac{2}{2+d}} (8\sqrt{d})^{\frac{2d}{2+d}} C_q^{\frac{2}{2+d}} \left(\frac{L}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{2d}{2+d}}$. If $M^{2+d} \geq 4(8\sqrt{d})^d C_q \rho^2 L^d$, then $4(8\sqrt{d})^d C_q \frac{L^d}{M^d} \leq \frac{M^2}{\rho^2}$, so we also have $\sigma(q) \leq \min\left(\frac{M^2}{\rho^2}, 4(8\sqrt{d})^d C_q \frac{L^d}{M^d}\right) = 4(8\sqrt{d})^d C_q \frac{L^d}{M^d} \leq 4^{\frac{2}{2+d}} (8\sqrt{d})^{\frac{2d}{2+d}} C_q^{\frac{2}{2+d}} \left(\frac{L}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{2d}{2+d}}$. \square

Hence, to bound the total sensitivity of $F(\mathcal{S}(L), \rho)$, we need a bound of $C_Q = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{q \in Q} C_q^{\frac{2}{2+d}}$.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose $Q \subset [0, L]^d$ of size n , $\eta = \min_{q, q' \in Q, q \neq q'} \|q - q'\|_\infty$, and C_Q is given by (3.1). Then we have*

$$C_Q \leq C_d \min\left(\left(\log_2 \frac{L}{\eta}\right)^{\frac{2}{2+d}}, \left(\frac{1}{d} \log_2 n\right)^{\frac{2}{2+d}}\right),$$

where $C_d = 2^{d+1}$.

Proof. We define $\tilde{C}_Q := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{q \in Q} C_q$, and using Hölder inequality we have

$$C_Q = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{q \in Q} C_q^{\frac{2}{2+d}} \leq \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{q \in Q} C_q\right)^{\frac{2}{2+d}} n^{\frac{d}{2+d}} = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{q \in Q} C_q\right)^{\frac{2}{2+d}} = (\tilde{C}_Q)^{\frac{2}{2+d}}.$$

So, we only need to bound \tilde{C}_Q .

We define $r_q := \arg \max_{0 < r \leq L} \frac{r^d}{L^d} \frac{n}{|Q \cap B_\infty(q, r)|}$ for all $q \in Q$, $Q_i := \{q \in Q \mid \frac{L}{2^{i+1}} < r_q \leq \frac{L}{2^i}\}$, and $A := \{i \geq 0 \mid i \text{ is an integer and } |Q_i| > 0\}$.

For any fixed $i \in A$, we use $l_i := \frac{L}{2^{i+1}}$ as the side length of grid cell to partition the region $[0, L]^d$ into $s_i = \left(\frac{L}{l_i}\right)^d = 2^{(i+1)d}$ grid cells: $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_{s_i}$ where each Ω_j is a closed set, and define $Q_{i,j} := Q_i \cap \Omega_j$. Then, $|Q_i \cap \bar{B}_\infty(q, l_i)| \geq |Q_{i,j}|$ for all $q \in Q_{i,j}$ where $\bar{B}_\infty(q, l_i) := \{q' \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|q' - q\|_\infty \leq l_i\}$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{q \in Q_i} \frac{r_q^d}{L^d} \frac{1}{|Q_i \cap B_\infty(q, r_q)|} &\leq \sum_{q \in Q_i} \frac{L^d}{2^{id} L^d} \frac{1}{|Q_i \cap B_\infty(q, r_q)|} \leq \frac{1}{2^{id}} \sum_{q \in Q_i} \frac{1}{|Q_i \cap \bar{B}_\infty(q, l_i)|} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^{id}} \sum_{j \in [s_i], |Q_{i,j}| > 0} \sum_{q \in Q_{i,j}} \frac{1}{|Q_i \cap \bar{B}_\infty(q, l_i)|} \leq \frac{1}{2^{id}} \sum_{j \in [s_i], |Q_{i,j}| > 0} \sum_{q \in Q_{i,j}} \frac{1}{|Q_{i,j}|} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{id}} \sum_{j \in [s_i], |Q_{i,j}| > 0} \frac{|Q_{i,j}|}{|Q_{i,j}|} \leq \frac{s_i}{2^{id}} = \frac{2^{(i+1)d}}{2^{id}} = 2^d. \end{aligned}$$

Then using the definitions of \tilde{C}_Q and r_q we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C}_Q &= \sum_{q \in Q} \max_{0 < r \leq L} \frac{r^d}{L^d} \frac{1}{|Q \cap B_\infty(q, r)|} = \sum_{q \in Q} \frac{r_q^d}{L^d} \frac{1}{|Q \cap B_\infty(q, r_q)|} = \sum_{i \in A} \sum_{q \in Q_i} \frac{r_q^d}{L^d} \frac{1}{|Q \cap B_\infty(q, r)|} \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in A} \sum_{q \in Q_i} \frac{r_q^d}{L^d} \frac{1}{|Q_i \cap B_\infty(q, r)|} \leq \sum_{i \in A} 2^d = 2^d |A|. \end{aligned}$$

We assert $r_q \geq Ln^{-\frac{1}{d}}$ for all $q \in Q$. This is because for any $r \in (0, Ln^{-\frac{1}{d}})$ we have

$$\frac{r^d}{L^d} \frac{n}{|Q \cap B_\infty(q, r)|} \leq \frac{L^d}{nL^d} \frac{n}{1} = 1 \leq \frac{L^d}{L^d} \frac{n}{|Q \cap B_\infty(q, L)|},$$

which implies the optimal $r_q \in [Ln^{-\frac{1}{d}}, L]$. Moreover, since $r_q \geq \min_{q' \in Q, q' \neq q} \|q - q'\|_\infty \geq \eta$, we have $r_q \geq \max(Ln^{-\frac{1}{d}}, \eta)$ for all $q \in Q$. If $i > \min(\log_2 \frac{L}{\eta}, \frac{1}{d} \log_2 n)$, then $\frac{L}{2^i} < \max(Ln^{-\frac{1}{d}}, \eta) \leq r_q$, and from the definition of Q_i and A we know $i \notin A$, which implies $|A| \leq 1 + \min(\log_2 \frac{L}{\eta}, \frac{1}{d} \log_2 n)$. Hence we obtain $\tilde{C}_Q \leq 2^{d+1} \min(\log_2 \frac{L}{\eta}, \frac{1}{d} \log_2 n)$ and using $C_Q = (\tilde{C}_Q)^{\frac{2}{2+d}}$ we prove the lemma. \square

Since $f_{S_1, S_2} \in F(\mathcal{S}(L), \rho)$, we know $f_{S_1, S_2}(q) \leq dL^2$ for all $q \in Q$ and $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{q' \in Q} f_{S_1, S_2}(q') \geq \rho^2$, so $\sigma(q) \leq \frac{dL^2}{\rho^2}$ for all $q \in Q$. Thus, we can expand $\frac{1}{|Q|} \sum_{q \in Q} \sigma(q)$ using Lemma 3.2 and factor out C_Q using Lemma 3.3 to immediately obtain the following theorem about the total sensitivity of $F(\mathcal{S}(L), \rho)$.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose $L > \rho > 0$, $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\} \subset [0, L]^d$ and $\eta = \min_{q, q' \in Q, q \neq q'} \|q - q'\|_\infty$. Then, we have*

$$\mathfrak{S}(F(\mathcal{S}(L), \rho)) \leq \mathfrak{S}_Q = O\left(\left(\frac{L}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{2d}{2+d}} \min\left(\log \frac{L}{\eta}, \log n, \left(\frac{L}{\rho}\right)^2\right)^{\frac{2}{2+d}}\right).$$

From Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 3.1, using [21][Lemma 2.1] we can obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $L > \rho > 0$, $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\} \subset [0, L]^d$, $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}(L)$ and $d_Q(S_1, S_2) \geq \rho$. Suppose $\sigma(q)$ and \mathfrak{S}_Q are defined in Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 3.1 respectively. Then for $\delta, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ a σ -sensitive sampling of size $N \geq \frac{\mathfrak{S}_Q}{\delta \varepsilon^2}$ provides \tilde{Q} , a $(\rho, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -coreset; that is with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have*

$$(1 - \varepsilon)d_Q(S_1, S_2) \leq d_{\tilde{Q}, W}(S_1, S_2) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)d_Q(S_1, S_2).$$

If Q describes a continuous uniform distribution in $[0, L]^d$ (or sufficiently close to one, like points on a grid), then there exists an absolute constant $C > 0$ such that $C_q \leq C$ for all $q \in Q$, then in Lemma 3.2 $\sigma(q) \leq C_d \left(\frac{L}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{2d}{2+d}}$ for all $q \in Q$, and in Theorem 3.1 $\mathfrak{S}_Q \leq C_d \left(\frac{L}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{2d}{2+d}}$. So, for uniform distribution, the sample size of Q in Theorem 3.2 is independent from the size of Q , and for $d = 2$ the bound $\mathfrak{S}_Q = O(L/\rho)$ matches the lower bound in Lemma 3.1.

Corollary 3.1. *If Q describes the continuous uniform distribution over $[0, L]^d$, then the sample size in Theorem 3.2 can be reduced to $N = O\left(\left(\frac{L}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{2d}{2+d}} \frac{1}{\delta \varepsilon^2}\right)$.*

Remark. To compute the upper bound of $\sigma(q)$ in Lemma 3.2, we need to compute C_q which can be obtained in $O(n \log n)$ time. For any fixed $q \in Q$, we sort $Q \setminus \{q\} = \{q_1, \dots, q_{n-1}\}$ according to their l^∞ distance from q , so that $\|q - q_i\|_\infty \leq \|q - q_j\|_\infty$ for any $i < j$. Then for $i \in [n]$ we compute $\frac{r_i^d}{L^d} \frac{n}{i}$, where $r_i = \|q - q_i\|_\infty$ for $i \in [n-1]$ and $r_n = L$, and choose the maximum value of $\frac{r_i^d}{L^d} \frac{n}{i}$ as C_q .

4 Strong Coresets for the Distance Between Trajectories

In this section, we study the distance d_Q defined on a subset of $\mathcal{S}(L)$: the collection of k -piecewise linear curves, and use the framework in [4] to construct a strong approximation for Q . We assume the multiset Q contains m distinct points q_1, \dots, q_m , where each point q_i appears m_i times and $\sum_{i=1}^m m_i = n$. So, in this section Q will be viewed as a set $\{q_1, \dots, q_m\}$ (not a multiset) and each point $q \in Q$ has a weight $w(q_i) = \frac{m_i}{n}$.

Suppose $\mathcal{T}_k := \{\gamma = \langle c_0, \dots, c_k \rangle \mid c_i \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is the collection of all piecewise-linear curves with k line segments in \mathbb{R}^d . For $\gamma = \langle c_0, \dots, c_k \rangle \in \mathcal{T}_k$, $\langle c_0, \dots, c_k \rangle$ is the sequence of $k+1$ critical points of γ . The value $\text{dist}(q, \gamma) = \inf_{p \in \gamma} \|p - q\|$, and function $f_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}(q) = (\text{dist}(q, \gamma_1) - \text{dist}(q, \gamma_2))^2$ are defined as before. We now use weights $w(q_i) = \frac{m_i}{n}$ ($\sum_{q \in Q} w(q) = 1$) and the resulting distance is $d_Q(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \left(\sum_{q \in Q} w(q) f_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}(q)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

For $L > \rho > 0$, $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we define

$$\mathcal{X}_k^d(L, \rho) := \{(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \mathcal{T}_k \times \mathcal{T}_k \mid \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{S}(L), d_Q(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \geq \rho\}.$$

We next consider the sensitivity adjusted weights $w'(q) = \frac{\sigma(q)}{\mathfrak{S}_Q} w(q)$ and cost function $g_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}(q) = \frac{1}{\sigma(q)} \frac{f_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}(q)}{f_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}}$. These use the general bounds for sensitivity in Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 3.1, with as usual $\bar{f}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} = \sum_{q \in Q} w(q) f_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}(q)$. These induce an adjusted range space $(Q, \mathcal{T}'_{k,d})$ where each element is defined

$$T_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \eta} = \{q \in Q \mid w'(q) g_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}(q) \leq \eta, \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{X}_k^d(L, \rho)\}.$$

Now to apply the strong coresets construction of Braverman *et al.* [4][Theorem 5.5] we only need to bound the shattering dimension of $(Q, \mathcal{T}'_{k,d})$.

Two recent results provide bounds on the VC-dimension of range spaces related to trajectories. Given a range space (X, \mathcal{R}) with VC-dimension ν and shattering dimension \mathfrak{s} , it is known that $\mathfrak{s} = O(\nu \log \nu)$ and $\nu = O(\mathfrak{s})$. So up to logarithmic factors these terms are bounded by each other. First Driemel *et al.* [11] shows VC-dimension for a ground set of curves \mathbb{X}_m of length m , with respect to metric balls around curves of length k , for various distance between curves. The most relevant case is where $m = 1$ (so the ground set are points like Q), and the Hausdorff distance is considered, where the VC-dimension in $d = 2$ is bounded $O(k^2 \log(km)) = O(k^2 \log k)$ and is at least $\Omega(\max\{k, \log m\}) = \Omega(k)$. Second, Matheny *et al.* [23] considered ground sets \mathbb{X}_k of trajectories of length k , and ranges defined by geometric shapes which may intersect those trajectories anywhere to include them in a subset. The most relevant cases is when they consider disks, and show the VC-dimension is at most $O(d \log k)$, and have a proof that implies it is at least $\Omega(\log k)$; but this puts the complexity k on the ground set not the query. More specifically, neither of these cases directly imply the results for our intended range space, since ours involves a pair of trajectories.

Lemma 4.1. *The shattering dimension of range space $(Q, \mathcal{T}'_{k,d})$ is $O(k^3)$, for constant d .*

Proof. Suppose $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \mathcal{X}_k^d(L, \rho)$ and $\eta \geq 0$, where $\gamma_1 = \langle c_{1,0}, \dots, c_{1,k} \rangle$ and $\gamma_2 = \langle c_{2,0}, \dots, c_{2,k} \rangle$, then we can define the range $T_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \eta}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \eta} &:= \{q \in Q \mid w'(q)g_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}(q) \leq \eta\} \\ &= \{q \in Q \mid w(q)f_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}(q) \leq \mathfrak{S}_Q \bar{f}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} \eta\} \\ &= \{q \in Q \mid w(q)(\text{dist}(q, \gamma_1) - \text{dist}(q, \gamma_2))^2 \leq \mathfrak{S}_Q \bar{f}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} \eta\}. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 3: Illustration of the $\text{dist}(q, s_j)$ from point q to segment s_j .

For a trajectory γ defined by critical points c_0, c_1, \dots, c_k for $j \in [k]$ define s_j as the segment between c_{j-1}, c_j and ℓ_j as the line extension of that segment. The distance between q and a segment s_j is illustrated in Figure 3 and defined

$$\xi_j := \text{dist}(q, s_j) = \begin{cases} \text{dist}(q, c_{j-1}), & \text{if } \langle c_j - c_{j-1}, q - c_{j-1} \rangle \leq 0 \\ \text{dist}(q, c_j), & \text{if } \langle c_{j-1} - c_j, q - c_j \rangle \leq 0 \\ \text{dist}(q, \ell_j), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Then $\text{dist}(q, \gamma) = \min_{j \in [k]} \xi_j$. For trajectories γ_1 and γ_2 , specify these segment distances as $\xi_i^{(1)}$ and $\xi_i^{(2)}$, respectively. Then the expression for $T_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \eta}$ can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \eta} &= \{q \in Q \mid w'(q)g_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}(q) \leq \eta\} \\ &= \{q \in Q \mid w(q)(\min_{j \in [k]} \xi_j^{(1)} - \min_{j \in [k]} \xi_j^{(2)})^2 \leq \mathfrak{S}_Q \bar{f}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} \eta\} \\ &= \cup_{j_1, j_2 \in [k]} \{q \in Q \mid \xi_{j_1}^{(1)} \leq \xi_j^{(1)}, \xi_{j_2}^{(2)} \leq \xi_j^{(2)} \text{ for all } j \in [k], w(q)(\xi_{j_1}^{(1)} - \xi_{j_2}^{(2)})^2 \leq \mathfrak{S}_Q \bar{f}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} \eta\} \\ &= \bigcup_{j_1, j_2 \in [k]} \left(\begin{array}{l} (\cap_{j \in [k], j \neq j_1} \{q \in Q \mid \xi_{j_1}^{(1)} \leq \xi_j^{(1)}\}) \\ \cap (\cap_{j \in [k], j \neq j_2} \{q \in Q \mid \xi_{j_2}^{(2)} \leq \xi_j^{(2)}\}) \\ \cap \{q \in Q \mid \sqrt{w(q)}(\xi_{j_1}^{(1)} - \xi_{j_2}^{(2)}) \leq (\mathfrak{S}_Q \bar{f}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} \eta)^{\frac{1}{2}}\} \\ \cap \{q \in Q \mid \sqrt{w(q)}(\xi_{j_2}^{(2)} - \xi_{j_1}^{(1)}) \leq (\mathfrak{S}_Q \bar{f}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} \eta)^{\frac{1}{2}}\} \end{array} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This means set $T_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \eta}$ can be decomposed as the union and intersection of $O(k^3)$ simply-defined subsets of Q . Specifically looking at the last line, this can be seen as the union over $O(k^2)$ sets (the outer union), and the first two lines are the intersection of $O(k)$ sets, and the last two lines inside the union are the intersection with one set each.

Next we argue that each of these $O(k^3)$ simply defined subsets of Q can be characterized as an element of a range space. By standard combinatorics [19, 2] (and spelled out in Lemma A.1), the bound of the shattering dimension of the entire range space is $O(k^3)$ times the shattering dimension of any of these simple ranges spaces.

To get this simple range space shattering dimension bound, we can use a similar linearization method as presented in the proof of Lemma 2.1. For any simple range space \mathcal{R} determined by the set decomposition of $T_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \eta}$, we can introduce new variables $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}, z, c \in \mathbb{R}^{d'}$, where z depends only on q , and c_0, c_i depend only on γ_1, γ_2 and r , and d' only depends on d . Here, Q is a fixed set and thus \mathfrak{S}_Q is a constant. By introducing new variables we can construct an injective map $\varphi : Q \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{d'}$, s.t. $\varphi(q) = z$. There is also an injective map from \mathcal{R} to $\{\{z \in \varphi(Q) \mid c_0 + z^T c \leq 0\} \mid c_0 \in \mathbb{R}, c \in \mathbb{R}^{d'}\}$. Since the shattering dimension of the range space $(\mathbb{R}^{d'}, \mathcal{H}^{d'})$, where $\mathcal{H}^{d'} = \{h \text{ is a halfspace in } \mathbb{R}^{d'}\}$, is $O(d')$, we have the shattering dimension of (Q, \mathcal{R}) is $O(d') \leq C_d$ where C_d is a positive constant depending only on d . Piecing this all together we obtain $C_d k^3$ bound for the shattering dimension of $(Q, \mathcal{J}'_{k,d})$. \square

Now, we can directly apply Lemma 4.1 and [4][Theorem 5.5] to get a $(\rho, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -strong coresets for $\mathcal{X}_k^d(L, \rho)$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $L > \rho > 0$, $Q \subset [0, L]^d$, and consider trajectory pairs $\mathcal{X}_k^d(L, \rho)$. Suppose $\sigma(q)$ and \mathfrak{S}_Q are defined in Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 3.1 respectively. Then for $\delta, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ a σ -sensitive sampling of size $N = O(\frac{\mathfrak{S}_Q}{\varepsilon^2} (k^3 \log \mathfrak{S} + \log \frac{1}{\delta}))$ provides \tilde{Q} , a strong $(\rho, \varepsilon, \delta)$ -coreset; that is with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all pairs $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{X}_k^d(L, \rho)$ we have*

$$(1 - \varepsilon) \mathfrak{d}_Q(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \leq \mathfrak{d}_{\tilde{Q}, W}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \mathfrak{d}_Q(\gamma_1, \gamma_2).$$

5 Trajectory Reconstruction

In Section 4, we use Q to convert a piecewise-linear curve γ to a vector $v_Q(\gamma)$ in $\mathbb{R}^{|Q|}$, and in this section we study how to recover γ from Q and $v_Q(\gamma)$, and we only consider γ in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Let $\mathcal{T} := \{\gamma = \langle c_0, \dots, c_k \rangle \mid c_i \in \mathbb{R}^2, k \geq 1\}$ be the set of all piecewise-linear curves in \mathbb{R}^2 . Each curve in \mathcal{T} is specified by a series of critical points $\langle c_0, c_1, \dots, c_k \rangle$, and k line segments s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k , where s_i is the line segment $\overline{c_{i-1}c_i}$.

For a curve $\gamma \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\tau > 0$ we define a family of curves $\mathcal{T}_\tau \subset \mathcal{T}$ s.t. each $\gamma \in \mathcal{T}_\tau$ has two restrictions:

- (R1) Each angle $\angle_{[c_{i-1}, c_i, c_{i+1}]}$ about an internal critical point c_i is non-zero (i.e., in $(0, \pi)$).
- (R2) Each critical point c_i is τ -separated, that is the disk $B(c_i, \tau) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \|x - c_i\| \leq \tau\}$ only intersects the two adjacent segments s_{i-1} and s_i of γ , or one adjacent segment for endpoints (i.e., only the s_1 for c_0 and s_k for c_k).

We next restrict that all curves (and Q) lie in region $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Let $\mathcal{T}_\tau(\Omega)$ be the subset of \mathcal{T}_τ where all curves γ have all critical points within Ω , and in particular, no $c_i \in \gamma$ is within a distance τ of the boundary of Ω . Now for $i > 0$, define an infinite grid $G_i = \{g_\eta \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid g_\eta = \eta v \text{ for } v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$, where \mathbb{Z} is all integers.

Suppose $\eta \leq \frac{\tau}{32}$, $Q = G_\eta \cap \Omega = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$, $\gamma \in \mathcal{T}_\tau(\Omega)$, $v_i = \min_{p \in \gamma} \|q_i - p\|$ and $v_Q(\gamma) = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$. We define some notations that are used in this section for the implied circle $C_i := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \|x - q_i\| = v_i\}$, the closed disk $B_i := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \|x - q_i\| \leq v_i\}$, and the open disk $\hat{B}_i := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \|x - q_i\| < v_i\}$ around each q_i or radius v_i . When the radius is specified as r (with perhaps $r \neq v_i$), then we, as follows, denote the associated circle $C_{i,r}$, closed disk $B_{i,r}$, and open disk $\hat{B}_{i,r}$ around q_i .

For $Q, \gamma \in \mathcal{T}_\tau(\Omega)$ and $v_Q(\gamma)$ we have the following three observations.

- (O1) In any disk with radius less than τ , there is at most one critical point of γ ; by (R2).
- (O2) If a point moves along γ , then it can only stop or change direction at critical points of γ .

(O3) For any $q_i \in Q$, γ cannot go into \dot{B}_i . Moreover, C_i must contain at least one point of γ , and if this point is not a critical point, then γ must be tangent to C_i at this point.

The restriction (R2) only implies if there is a critical point of γ , then in its neighborhood γ has at most two line segments. However, if there is no critical point in a region, then the shape of γ can be very complicated in this region, so we need to first identify the regions that contain a critical point.

The entire algorithm is overviewed in Algorithm 5.1. For each critical point $c \in \gamma$, there exists $q \in Q$ such that $\text{dist}(q, c) < \eta$. So to recover γ , we first traverse $\{q_i \in Q \mid v_i < \eta\}$ and use $\text{ISCRITICAL}(q_i)$ (Algorithm 5.2) to solve the decision problem of if there is a critical point in $B_{i,3\eta}$. Whenever there is a critical point in $B_{i,3\eta}$, we then use $\text{FINDCRITICAL}(q_i)$ (Algorithm 5.3) to find it – collectively, this finds all critical points of γ . Finally, we use DETERMINEORDER (Algorithm 5.4) to determine the order of all critical points of γ , which recovers γ .

Algorithm 5.1 Recover $\gamma \in \mathcal{T}_\tau(L)$ from Q and $v_Q(\gamma)$

```

Initialize  $Q_\eta := \{q_i \in Q \mid v_i < \eta\}$ , close set  $Q_r := \emptyset$ , endpoints  $E = \emptyset$  and critical points  $A := \emptyset$ .
for each  $q_i \in Q_\eta$  do
  if  $q_i \in Q_r$  or  $\text{ISCRITICAL}(q_i) = \text{FALSE}$  then
    continue
  Let  $(c, S) := \text{FINDCRITICAL}(q_i)$ .
  if  $|S| = 1$  then
     $E := E \cup \{(c, S)\}$ . //  $c$  is an endpoint of  $\gamma$ 
  Let  $A := A \cup \{(c, S)\}$  and  $Q_r := Q_r \cup (Q_\eta \cap B_{c,16\eta})$ . // aggregate critical points
return  $\gamma := \text{DETERMINEORDER}(E, A)$ 

```

Existence of critical points. In Algorithm 5.2, we consider the common tangent line of C_i and C_j for all q_j in a neighborhood of q_i . If no common tangent line can go through $B_{i,3\eta}$ without going into the interior of any other circle centered in $B_{i,3\eta}$, then it implies there is a critical point of γ in $B_{i,3\eta}$.

Algorithm 5.2 $\text{ISCRITICAL}(q_i)$: Determine the existence of critical point in $B_{i,3\eta}$

```

for each  $q_j \in Q_{i,3\eta} \setminus \{q_i\}$  do
  Let  $\ell_{i,j}$  be a common tangent line of  $C_i$  and  $C_j$ .
  if  $\ell_{i,j}$  does not intersect with  $\dot{B}_k$  for all  $q_k \in Q_{i,3\eta} \setminus \{q_i, q_j\}$  then
    return FALSE
return TRUE // there must be a critical point in  $B_{i,3\eta}$ 

```




Figure 4: Left: l is tangent to C_i . Rotate l around C_i until it is tangent to some C_j . Center: c is an endpoint of γ . Right: c is an internal critical point of γ . In center and right figures, no tangent line of C_i can go through $B_{i,3\eta}$ without intersecting with the pink curve.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose $q_i \in Q$ and $v_i < \eta$. If $\text{ISCRITICAL}(q_i)$ (Algorithm 5.2) returns TRUE, then there must be a critical point of γ in $B_{i,3\eta}$. Moreover, for any critical point $c \in \gamma$ there exists some $q_i \in Q$ such that $v_i < \eta$ and $\text{ISCRITICAL}(q_i)$ (Algorithm 5.2) returns TRUE for the input q_i .*

Proof. If Algorithm 5.2 returns TRUE, then no common tangent of C_i and C_j ($q_j \in Q_{i,3\eta}$) can go through $B_{i,3\eta}$ without intersecting with some \dot{B}_k for $q_k \in Q_{i,3\eta}$. This implies no tangent line of C_i can go through $B_{i,3\eta}$ without intersecting with some \dot{B}_k for $q_k \in Q_{i,3\eta}$. Otherwise, as shown in Figure 4(Left), suppose tangent line ℓ can go through $B_{i,3\eta}$, then we can rotate ℓ around C_i to line ℓ' s.t. ℓ' is tangent to some C_j ($q_j \in Q_{i,3\eta}$) but does not intersect with any \dot{B}_k ($q_k \in Q_{i,3\eta}$), which leads to a contradiction. So, if there is no critical point on C_i then (O3) implies one line segment of γ must be tangent to C_i , but Algorithm 5.2 checks that no tangent line of C_i can go through $B_{i,3\eta}$ and thus from (O2) we know γ must have a critical point in $B_{i,3\eta}$.

If $c \in \gamma$ is a critical point, then there are two possibilities: c is an endpoint of γ , or c is an internal critical point of γ .

If c is an endpoint, let $q_i = (x_i, y_i)$ be the closest point in Q to c . Obviously we have $v_i < \eta$, and there is only one line segment s of γ in $B_{i,3\eta}$. We consider the points set $S_{i,2\eta} := \{(x_i + k_1\eta, y_i + k_2\eta) \mid \|(k_1, k_2)\|_\infty = 2\}$, i.e. the pink points in Figure 4(Center). Without loss of generality, we assume $q_{i_5} = (x_i + 2\eta, y_i)$ and $q_{i_6} = (x_i + 2\eta, y_i + \eta)$ are the two closest points in $S_{i,2\eta}$ to s , and their projection on s are p_{i_5} and p_{i_6} respectively (two green points in Figure 4(Center)). Let $q_{i_1} = (x_i + 2\eta, y_i + 2\eta)$, $q_{i_2} = (x_i - 2\eta, y_i + 2\eta)$, $q_{i_3} = (x_i - 2\eta, y_i - 2\eta)$ and $q_{i_4} = (x_i + 2\eta, y_i - 2\eta)$ be the four pink corners. Since the radius of C_i is $v_i < \eta$, we know any tangent line of C_i must intersect with the piecewise-linear curve $\langle p_{i_6}, q_{i_6}, q_{i_1}, q_{i_2}, q_{i_3}, q_{i_4}, q_{i_5}, p_{i_5} \rangle$ before it passes completely through $B_{i,3\eta}$. However, the curve $\langle p_{i_6}, q_{i_6}, q_{i_1}, q_{i_2}, q_{i_3}, q_{i_4}, q_{i_5}, p_{i_5} \rangle$ is covered (except points p_{i_6} and p_{i_5}) by open disks \dot{B}_k whose centers are in $q_k \in S_{i,2\eta} \subset Q_{i,3\eta}$. So, no tangent line of C_i can go through $B_{i,3\eta}$ without intersecting with some \dot{B}_k for $q_k \in Q_{i,3\eta}$.

If c is an internal critical point, then there are two line segments s_1, s_2 in $B_{i,3\eta}$. From (R1) we know the angle between s_1 and s_2 is less than π , and we define $\Omega(s_1, s_2) := \{p \in B_{i,3\eta} \mid p \text{ is outside the interior angle region formed by } s_1 \text{ and } s_2\}$. Let $q_i = (x_i, y_i)$ be the closest point in $\Omega(s_1, s_2)$ to c , and $S_{i,2\eta}$ be defined in the same way as before. We have $v_i < \eta$. We consider the points set $S_{i,2\eta} \cap \Omega(s_1, s_2)$, i.e. those pink points in Figure 4(Right). Without loss of generality, we assume $q_{i_3} = (x_i, y_i + 2\eta)$ and $q_{i_4} = (x_i, y_i - 2\eta)$ are two closest points in $S_{i,2\eta} \cap \Omega(s_1, s_2)$ to s_1 and s_2 respectively, and their projection on s_1 and s_2 are p_{i_3} and p_{i_4} respectively (two green points in Figure 4(Right)). In this setting, let $q_{i_1} = (x_i - 2\eta, y_i + 2\eta)$ and $q_{i_2} = (x_i - 2\eta, y_i - 2\eta)$ be the corner points of $S_{i,2\eta}$. Since the radius of C_i is $v_i < \eta$ and the angle formed by s_1 and s_2 is less than π , we know any tangent line of C_i must intersect with the piecewise-linear curve $\langle p_{i_4}, q_{i_4}, q_{i_2}, q_{i_1}, q_{i_3}, p_{i_3} \rangle$ before go through $B_{i,3\eta}$. However, the curve $\langle p_{i_4}, q_{i_4}, q_{i_2}, q_{i_1}, q_{i_3}, p_{i_3} \rangle$ is covered by open disks \dot{B}_k whose centers are $q_k \in S_{i,2\eta} \cap \Omega(s_1, s_2) \subset Q_{i,3\eta}$. So, we know no tangent line of C_i can pass entirely through $B_{i,3\eta}$ without intersecting with some \dot{B}_k for $q_k \in Q_{i,3\eta}$.

Thus, if c is a critical point of γ , Algorithm 5.2 will return TRUE for some $q_i \in Q$ with $v_i < \eta$. \square

Finding a critical point. If there is a critical point c in $B_{i,3\eta}$, then using (R2) we know in the neighborhood of c , γ has a particular pattern: it either has one line segment, or two line segments. We will need two straightforward subfunctions:

- FCT (*Find Common Tangents*) takes in three grid points q_i, q_j, q_k , and returns the all common tangent lines of C_j and C_k which do not intersect the interior of disks \dot{B}_l of an disk associated with a point $q_l \in Q_{i,8\eta}$. This generates a feasible superset of possible nearby line segments which may be part of γ .
- MOS (*Merge-Overlapping-Segments*) takes a set of line segments, and returns a smaller set, merging overlapping segments. This combines the just generated potential line segments of γ .

Now in Algorithm 5.3, for each pair $q_j, q_k \in B_{i,8\eta}$, we first use FCS to find the common tangent line of C_j, C_k that could be segments of γ , and then use MOS to reduce this set down to a minimal set of possibilities S_m . By definition, there must be a critical point c , and thus can be at most 2 actual segments of γ within $B_{i,8\eta}$, so we can then refine S_m . We first check if c is an endpoint, in which case there must be only one valid segment. If not, then there must be 2, and we need to consider all pairs in S_m . This check can be done by verifying that *every* C_k for $q_k \in Q_{i,8\eta}$ is tangent to the associated ray $\text{ray}(s)$ (for an endpoint) or for the associated rays $\text{ray}(s)$ and $\text{ray}(s')$ for their associated segment pairs (for an internal critical point).

Algorithm 5.3 FINDCRITICAL(q_i): Find a critical point in $B_{i,3\eta}$

```

Let  $Q_{i,8\eta} := Q \cap B_{i,8\eta}$  and  $S_t := \emptyset$ .
for each pair  $q_j, q_k \in Q_{i,8\eta}$  do
     $S_t := S_t \cup \text{FCT}(q_i, q_j, q_k)$ 
 $S_m := \text{MOS}(S_t)$ .
for each  $s \in S_m$  do
    Extend  $s$  to ray  $\text{ray}(s)$  with endpoint  $c$  where it first enters  $\dot{B}_k$  for some  $q_k \in Q_{i,8\eta}$ .
    if for all  $q_j \in Q_{i,8\eta}$  either  $c \in C_j$  or  $C_j$  is tangent to  $\text{ray}(s)$  (ENDPOINT) then
        return  $(c, \{s\})$  //  $c$  is an endpoint of  $\gamma$ 
for each pair  $s, s' \in S_m$  do
    Extend to lines  $\ell(s), \ell(s')$ .
    if  $\ell(s)$  and  $\ell(s')$  do not intersect in  $B_{i,8\eta}$  continue
    Set  $c = \ell(s) \cap \ell(s')$ , and define rays from  $c$  containing  $s$  and  $s'$  as  $\text{ray}(s)$  and  $\text{ray}(s')$ .
    if for all  $q_k \in Q_{i,8\eta}$  either  $c \in C_k$  or  $C_k$  is tangent to  $\text{ray}(s)$  or  $\text{ray}(s')$  (INTERNALPOINT) then
        return  $(c, \{s, s'\})$  //  $c$  is an internal critical point of  $\gamma$ 

```




Figure 5: Left: $\{c\} = C_{i_1} \cap C_{i_2} \cap C_{i_3}$ and $B_{i_1} \subset B_{i_2} \cup B_{i_3}$. Center: the angle between s and s' is at most $\frac{\pi}{4}$ and $\{c\} = C_{i_1} \cap C_{i_2} \cap C_{i_3}$ and $B_{i_1} \subset B_{i_2} \cup B_{i_3}$. Right: C_{i_1}, C_{i_2} are tangent to s , and C_{i_3}, C_{i_4} are tangent to s' . For each one of these four circles, any tangent line segment, except s, s' , cannot be extended outside $B_{i,8\eta}$ without intersecting with any other circle.

Lemma 5.2. Suppose $c' \in B_{i,3\eta}$ is a critical point of γ , and (c, S) is the output of FINDCRITICAL(q_i) (Algorithm 5.3), then $c = c'$. Moreover, $|S| = 1$ if and only if c is an endpoint of γ .

Proof. Since $c' \in B_{i,3\eta}$ and $\eta < \frac{\tau}{32}$, we have $B_{i,8\eta} \subset B(c', \frac{\tau}{2})$. So, from (R2) we know in $B_{i,8\eta}$, γ either has one line segment which means c' is an endpoint, or has two line segments which means c' is an interior critical point.

If c' is an endpoint, then the line segment of γ must satisfy Condition ENDPOINT in Algorithm 5.3. Moreover, if in Algorithm 5.3 s satisfies Condition ENDPOINT, then c must be a critical point of γ . This is because, as show in Figure 5(Left), there exists three points $q_{i_1}, q_{i_2}, q_{i_3} \in Q_{i,8\eta}$ such that $\{c\} = C_{i_1} \cap C_{i_2} \cap C_{i_3}$ and $B_{i_1} \subset B_{i_2} \cup B_{i_3}$ and the tangent of C_{i_1} at c intersects with $\dot{B}_{i_2} \cup \dot{B}_{i_3}$. This can be seen by observing there must exist points $q_{i_2}, q_{i_3} \in Q_{i,8\eta}$ which are (i) on the opposite side from s of the perpendicular to s through c , (ii) are a distance at least 3η from c , and (iii) within a distance of 3η from each other. This implies there exists another point $q_{i_1} \in Q \cap B_{i_2} \cap B_{i_3}$ and with $v_{i_1} \leq 2\eta$. Hence B_{i_1} must be contained in $B_{i_2} \cup B_{i_3}$. Thus, (O3) implies c is a critical point of γ , and from (O1) we know $c = c'$.

If c' is an interior point, then as show in Figure 5(Center and Right), no line segment can satisfy Condition ENDPOINT in Algorithm 5.3, so the algorithm will not stop before the third loop. Then the two line segments of γ with c' as the common endpoint can satisfy Condition INTERNALPOINT. Moreover, if s and s' satisfy Condition INTERNALPOINT, then we will show c must be a critical point of γ . There are two possibilities: the angle between s and s' at most $\frac{\pi}{4}$, or greater than $\frac{\pi}{4}$.

If the angle is less than or equal to $\frac{\pi}{4}$, then as shown in Figure 5(Center), there exists three points $q_{i_1}, q_{i_2}, q_{i_3} \in Q_{i,8\eta}$ such that $\{c\} = C_{i_1} \cap C_{i_2} \cap C_{i_3}$ and $B_{i_1} \subset B_{i_2} \cup B_{i_3}$ and the tangent of C_{i_1} at c intersects with $\dot{B}_{i_2} \cup \dot{B}_{i_3}$. This follows by the same argument as when c is an endpoint. So, (O3) implies c is a critical point of γ , and from (O1) we know $c = c'$.

If the angle is greater than $\frac{\pi}{4}$, then as shown in Figure 5(Right), there exists four points $q_{i_1}, q_{i_2}, q_{i_3}, q_{i_4} \in Q_{i,8\eta}$ outside the interior angular region, and such that C_{i_1}, C_{i_2} are tangent to s' , and C_{i_3}, C_{i_4} are tangent to s . Moreover, these four circles can be chosen to not intersect with each other. Next we can argue that because the angle is sufficiently large, we can block a path from c' to outside of $B_{i,8\eta}$ both inside the interior angular region, and outside it. Outside this region, we can choose three points in $q_{k_1}, q_{k_2}, q_{k_3} \in Q_{i,8\eta}$ of which C_{k_1} is incident to $\text{ray}(s)$, C_{k_2} is incident to c' , and C_{k_3} is incident to $\text{ray}(s')$; and that \dot{B}_{k_1} and \dot{B}_{k_2} intersect and \dot{B}_{k_2} and \dot{B}_{k_3} intersect. Similarly, inside the interior angular region, we can choose two points $q_{j_1}, q_{j_2} \in Q_{i,8\eta}$ so C_{j_1} and C_{j_2} are incident to $\text{ray}(s)$ and $\text{ray}(s')$, respectively, and that \dot{B}_{j_1} and \dot{B}_{j_2} intersect. These two sets of points blocks any other straight path from c' (required by (O2)) from existing $B_{i,8\eta}$ (required by (O1)) without entering the interior of some \dot{B}_k . And the first four points $q_{i_1}, q_{i_2}, q_{i_3}, q_{i_4}$ ensures that this c' is unique (by (O1)) and $c' = c$ must be a critical point on γ . \square

Using Algorithm 5.2 and 5.3 we can find all critical points (E, A) with associated line segments of γ , so the final step is to use function DETERMINEORDER(E, A) (Algorithm 5.4) to determine their order, as we argue it will completely recover γ .

Algorithm 5.4 DETERMINEORDER(E, A): Determine the order of critical points

Choose any $(c_0, S_0) \in E$, let $k = |A| - 1$, $A := A \setminus \{(c_0, S_0)\}$, $s_1 \in S_0$ and $\gamma := \langle c_0 \rangle$.
for $i = 1$ **to** k **do**
 Find closest c from $(c, S) \in A$ to c_{i-1} such that c is on $\text{ray}(s_i)$, and let $A := A \setminus \{(c, S)\}$.
 Append $c_i = c$ to γ , and if $i < k$ then let $s_{i+1} = s$ where $s \in S$ is not parallel with s_i .
return γ

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose $Q = G_\eta \cap \Omega$, $\eta \leq \frac{\pi}{32}$, and $v_Q(\gamma)$ is generated by Q and $\gamma \in \mathcal{T}_\tau(\Omega)$, then Algorithm 5.1 can recover γ from $v_Q(\gamma)$ in $O(|Q| + k^2)$ time, where k is the number of line segments of γ .*

Proof. From Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 we know Algorithms 5.2 and 5.3 identify all critical points of γ , and the line segments of γ associated with each critical point. So we only need to show Algorithm 5.4 determines the correct order of critical points. This is because if a point moves along γ it cannot stop or change direction until it hits a critical point (Observation (O2)), and when it hits a critical point it has to stop or change direction, otherwise it will violate (R1) or (R2). So, Algorithm 5.4 starts from an endpoint and moves along the direction of line segment associated with it, and changes the direction only after arriving at the next critical point, until all critical points are visited. This gives the correct order of critical points of γ .

Moreover, the running time of Algorithm 5.2 and 5.3 are constant, since they both only examine a constant number of points, circles, etc in each $B_{i,3\eta}$ or $B_{i,8\eta}$. And these can be retrieved using the implicit grid structure in constant time. Thus the **for** loop in Algorithm 5.1 takes $O(|Q|)$ time. The final Algorithm 5.4 to recover the order takes $O(k^2)$ time, since a constant fraction of steps need to check a constant fraction of all critical points in A . So, the total running time of this algorithm is $O(|Q| + k^2)$. \square

6 Conclusion

In this paper we analyze sketches via the $v_i(J) = \text{MinDist}(q_i, J) = \inf_{p \in J} \|p - q_i\|$ procedure, for a variety of geometric objects, and show how many and how measurement points Q can be chosen. Collecting n values $v_Q(J) = (v_1(J), \dots, v_n(J))$ leads to a simple to use and natural distance $\mathbf{d}_Q(J_1, J_2) = \|v_Q(J_1) - v_Q(J_2)\|$.

For hyperplanes, the sensitivity sampling framework can be applied fairly directly to chose Q , and requires about (d/ε^2) points or $O(d^2 \log d/\varepsilon^2)$ for stronger guarantees. However, for more general objects we show that a resolution parameter L/ρ needs to be introduced, and affects the sample size even in \mathbb{R}^2 . For instance, when the goal is to represent L shapes by their MinDist function as defined over a domain $[0, L]^2$, then $\Theta(\frac{L}{\rho} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2})$ samples are required for ε -error. For the case of piecewise-linear curves (e.g., trajectories) we can provide

even stronger error guarantees. By bounding an associated shattering dimension for curves of length at most k , we can provide strong approximation guarantees on \mathbf{d}_Q using roughly $\frac{L}{\rho} \log^2 \frac{L}{\rho} \cdot k^3 \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}$ samples. Moreover, we can exactly recover the trajectory γ using only its `MinDist` sketched vector $v_Q(\gamma)$.

While a companion paper [27] has provided experimental results which demonstrate this distance \mathbf{d}_Q is convenient and powerful in trajectory classification tasks, many other open questions remain. These include extending similar representations to other tasks, in theory and in practice. Moreover, our bounds rely on a few related minimum resolution parameters $\rho \leq \min_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} \mathbf{d}_Q(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$, τ is a gap between points in a grid Q required to recover γ , and $\eta = \min_{q, q' \in Q, q \neq q'} \|q - q'\|$ is a pairwise minimum distance on the multiset Q . While these parameters are in all scenarios we considered asymptotically equivalent, it would be useful to unify these terms in a single theory. Finally, we would like to show not just exact trajectory recovery (under conditions on γ and Q), but also to loosen those restrictions and provided topological recovery (e.g., geometric inference [5]) conditions for boundaries of compact sets.

References

- [1] N. Amenta, S. Choi, and R. K. Kolluri. The power crust. In *Proceedings of the sixth ACM symposium on Solid modeling and applications*, 2001.
- [2] M. Anthony and P. L. Bartlett. *Neural Network Learning: Theoretical Foundations*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [3] C. Boutsidis, M. W. Mahoney, and P. Drineas. An improved approximation algorithm for the column subset selection problem. In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, 2009.
- [4] V. Braverman, D. Feldman, and H. Lang. New frameworks for offline and streaming coresets constructions. arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.00889, 2016.
- [5] F. Chazal and D. Cohen-Steiner. Geometric inference. <https://geometrica.saclay.inria.fr/team/Fred.Chazal/papers/GeomInference5.pdf>.
- [6] F. Chazal, D. Cohen-Steiner, and Q. Mérigot. Geometric inference for probability measures. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, pages 1–19, 2010.
- [7] F. Chazal and A. Lieutier. The “ λ -medial axis”. *Graphical Models*, 67:304–331, 2005.
- [8] D. Chen and J. M. Phillips. Relative error embeddings for the gaussian kernel distance. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, 2017.
- [9] M. B. Cohen, C. Musco, and C. Musco. Input sparsity time low-rank approximation via ridge leverage score sampling. In *ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, 2017.
- [10] M. B. Cohen, C. Musco, and J. Pachocki. Online row sampling. In *International Workshop on Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization*, 2016.
- [11] A. Driemel, J. M. Phillips, and I. Psarros. On the vc dimension of metric balls under frechet and hausdorff distances. In *International Symposium on Computational Geometry*, 2019.
- [12] P. Drineas, M. Magdon-Ismael, M. W. Mahoney, and D. P. Woodruff. Fast approximation of statistical leverage. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13:3475–3506, 2012.
- [13] P. Drineas, M. W. Mahoney, and S. Muthukrishnan. Relative-error CUR matrix decompositions. *SIAM Journal of Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 30:844–881, 2008.
- [14] H. Edelsbrunner and E. P. Mücke. Three-dimensional alpha shapes. *ACM Transactions on Graphics*, 13:43–72, 1994.
- [15] D. Feldman and M. Langberg. A unified framework for approximating and clustering data. In *Proceedings ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2011.
- [16] D. Feldman, M. Schmidt, and C. Sohler. Turning big data into tiny data: Constant-size coresets for k -means, PCA, and projective clustering. In *Proceedings 24th ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, 2013.
- [17] D. Feldman and L. J. Schulman. Data reduction for weighted and outlier-resistant clustering. In *Proc. ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, 2012.
- [18] D. C.-S. Frederic Chazal and A. Lieutier. A sampling theory for compact sets in euclidean space. *DCG*, 41:461–479, 2009.
- [19] S. Har-Peled. *Geometric Approximation Algorithms*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. American Mathematical Society, 2011.

- [20] W. B. Johnson and J. Lindenstrauss. Extensions of Lipschitz maps into a Hilbert space. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 26:189–206, 1984.
- [21] M. Langberg and L. J. Schulman. Universal ε -approximators for integrals. In *SODA*, pages 598–607, 2010.
- [22] D. Lopaz-Paz, K. Muandet, B. Schölkopf, and I. Tolstikhin. Towards a learning theory of cause-effect inference. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2015.
- [23] M. Matheny, D. Xie, and J. M. Phillips. Scalable spatial scan statistics for trajectories. Technical report, arXiv:1906.01693, 2019.
- [24] K. Muandet, K. Fukumizu, B. Sriperumbudur, and B. Schölkopf. Kernel mean embedding of distributions: A review and beyond. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 10:1–141, 2017.
- [25] C. Musco and C. Musco. Recursive sampling for the Nyström method. In *NIPS*, 2017.
- [26] J. M. Phillips and W. M. Tai. Relative error rkhs embeddings for gaussian kernels. Technical report, arXiv:1811.04136, 2018.
- [27] J. M. Phillips and P. Tang. Simple distances for trajectories via landmarks. Technical report, arXiv:1804.11284, 2019.
- [28] J. M. Phillips, B. Wang, and Y. Zheng. Geometric inference on kernel density estimates. In *SOCG*, 2015.
- [29] K. Varadarajan and X. Xiao. On the sensitivity of shape fitting problems. In *Proceedings International Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science*. arxiv:1209.4893, 2012.

A A Lemma Used in Section 4

Lemma A.1. *Suppose $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d, X_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_1}, X_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$, and $\mathcal{R}_1 = \{\{q \in Q \mid g_1(q, x) \leq 0\} \mid x \in X_1\}$, $\mathcal{R}_2 = \{\{q \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid g_2(q, x) \leq 0\} \mid x \in X_2\}$ where g_1, g_2 can be any fixed real functions. Define $\mathcal{R}_3 = \{\{q \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid g_1(q, x_1) \leq 0\} \cap \{q \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid g_2(q, x_2) \leq 0\} \mid x_1 \in X_1, x_2 \in X_2\}$, $\mathcal{R}_4 = \{\{q \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid g_1(q, x_1) \leq 0\} \cup \{q \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid g_2(q, x_2) \leq 0\} \mid x_1 \in X_1, x_2 \in X_2\}$. If $\dim(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathcal{R}_1) = s_1$ and $\dim(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathcal{R}_2) = s_2$, then $\dim(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathcal{R}_3) \leq s_1 + s_2$ and $\dim(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathcal{R}_4) \leq s_1 + s_2$.*

Proof. Suppose $G \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and $|G| \leq \infty$, then we have

$$\{G \cap R \mid R \in \mathcal{R}_3\} = \{(G \cap R_1) \cap (G \cap R_2) \mid R_1 \in \mathcal{R}_1, R_2 \in \mathcal{R}_2\}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

So, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\{G \cap R \mid R \in \mathcal{R}_3\}| &= |\{(G \cap R_1) \cap (G \cap R_2) \mid R_1 \in \mathcal{R}_1, R_2 \in \mathcal{R}_2\}| \\ &\leq |\{G \cap R_1 \mid R_1 \in \mathcal{R}_1\}| \times |\{G \cap R_2 \mid R_2 \in \mathcal{R}_2\}| \leq |G|^{s_1} |G|^{s_2} = |G|^{s_1 + s_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

which implies $\dim(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathcal{R}_3) \leq s_1 + s_2$, and similarly we have $\dim(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathcal{R}_4) \leq s_1 + s_2$. \square

B Sensitivity Computation and its Relationship with Leverage Score

In this section, we describe how to compute the sensitivity score $\sigma(x_i)$ for each $x_i \in Q$. To this end, we can invoke a theorem about vector norms by Langberg and Shulman [21]:

Lemma B.1 (Theorem 2.2 in [21]). *Suppose μ is a probability measure on a metric space X , and $V = \{v : X \mapsto \mathbb{R}\}$ is a real vector space of dimension κ . Let $F = \{f : X \mapsto [0, \infty) \mid \exists v \in V \text{ s.t. } f(x) = v(x)^2, \forall x \in X\}$, and $\{v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(\kappa)}\}$ be an orthonormal basis for V under the inner product $\langle u, v \rangle := \int_X u(x)v(x)d\mu(x)$, $\forall u, v \in V$. Then, $\sigma_{F, X, \mu}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} v^{(i)}(x)^2$ and $\mathfrak{S}(F) = \kappa$.*

We have already set $X = Q$ and $\mu = \frac{1}{n}$, and have defined V and F . To apply the above theorem need to define an orthonormal basis $\{v^{(1)}, v^{(2)}, \dots, v^{(d+1)}\}$ for V . A straightforward basis (although not necessarily an orthonormal one) exists as $v^{(d+1)}(q) = v_{e^{(d+1)}}(q) = 1$ and $v^{(i)}(q) = v_{e^{(i)}}(q) = x_i$ for all $i \in [d]$ and $q = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $e^{(i)} = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ is an indicator vector with all zeros except 1 in i th coordinate. That is the i th basis element $v^{(i)}$ is simply the i th coordinate of the input. Since Q is full rank, $\{v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(d+1)}\}$ is a basis of V .

We are now ready to state our theorem on computing sensitivity scores on a general (F, Q, μ) , where we typically set $\mu = \frac{1}{n}$.

Theorem B.1. *Suppose μ is a probability measure on a metric space $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ such that $\mu(q_i) = p_i > 0$ for all $i \in [n]$, $V = \{v : Q \mapsto \mathbb{R}\}$ is a real vector space of dimension κ with a basis $\{v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(\kappa)}\}$, and $F = \{f : Q \mapsto [0, \infty) \mid \exists v \in V \text{ s.t. } f(q) = v(q)^2, \forall q \in Q\}$. If we introduce a $\kappa \times n$ matrix A whose i th column a_i is defined as: $a_i = (v^{(1)}(q_i)\sqrt{p_i}, \dots, v^{(\kappa)}(q_i)\sqrt{p_i})^T$, then we have*

$$\sigma_{F, Q, \mu}(q_i) \cdot p_i = a_i^T (AA^T)^{-1} a_i, \quad \forall q_i \in Q. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Proof. Suppose the QR decomposition of A^T is $A^T = \tilde{Q}\tilde{R}$, where \tilde{Q} is an $n \times \kappa$ orthogonal matrix ($\tilde{Q}^T\tilde{Q} = I$), and \tilde{R} is an $n \times n$ upper triangular matrix. Since $\{v^{(1)}, \dots, v^{(\kappa)}\}$ is a basis of V , the columns of A^T are linear independent, which implies the matrix \tilde{R} is invertible. Using the fact that $\tilde{Q}^T\tilde{Q}$ is an identity matrix, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A^T (AA^T)^{-1} A &= \tilde{Q}\tilde{R}(\tilde{R}^T\tilde{Q}^T\tilde{Q}\tilde{R})^{-1}\tilde{R}^T\tilde{Q}^T = \tilde{Q}\tilde{R}(\tilde{R}^T\tilde{R})^{-1}\tilde{R}^T\tilde{Q}^T \\ &= \tilde{Q}\tilde{R}\tilde{R}^{-1}(\tilde{R}^T)^{-1}\tilde{R}^T\tilde{Q}^T = \tilde{Q}\tilde{Q}^T \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

From Lemma B.1, we have $\sigma_{F, Q, \mu}(q_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{\kappa} (\tilde{Q}_{i,j})^2$, which is the i -th entry on the diagonal of $\tilde{Q}\tilde{Q}^T$, so from (B.2), we obtain (B.1). \square

This theorem not only shows how to compute the sensitivity of a point, but also gives the relationship between sensitivity and the leverage score.

Leverage score. Let $(\cdot)^+$ denotes the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of a matrix, so $(AA^T)^+ = (AA^T)^{-1}$ when AA^T is full rank. The *leverage score* [13] of the i th column a_i of matrix A is defined as: $\tau_i(A) := a_i^T (AA^T)^+ a_i$.

This definition is more specific and linear-algebraic than sensitivity. However, Theorem B.1 shows that value $\sigma_{F,Q,\mu}(x_i) \cdot p_i$ is just the leverage score of the i th column of the matrix A . Compared to sensitivity, leverage scores have received more attention for scalable algorithm development and approximation [13, 3, 12, 9, 25, 10]

B.1 Estimate the Distance by Online Row Sampling

If the dimensionality is too high and the number of points is too large to be stored and processed in memory, we can apply online row sampling [10] to estimate \mathbf{d}_Q . Note that as more rows are witnessed the leverage score of older rows change. While other approaches (c.f. [12, 9, 25]) can obtain similar (and maybe slightly stronger) bounds, they rely on more complex procedures to manage these updating scores. The following Algorithm B.1 by Cohen *et al.* [10], on the other hand, simply samples columns as they come proportional to their estimated ridge leverage score [9]; thus it seems like the “right” approach.

Algorithm B.1 ONLINE-SAMPLE(A, ε, δ)

Set $\lambda := \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon}$, $c := 8 \log(\frac{d}{\varepsilon^2})$, and let \tilde{A} be empty (a $0 \times d$ matrix).
for rows $a_i \in A$ **do**
 Let $p_i := \min(c \cdot (1 + \varepsilon) a_i^T (\tilde{A}^T \tilde{A} + \lambda I)^{-1} a_i, 1)$.
 With probability p_i , append row $a_i / \sqrt{p_i}$ to \tilde{A} ; otherwise do nothing.
return \tilde{A} .

According to the Theorem 3 in [10], Algorithm B.1 returns a matrix \tilde{A} , with high probability, such that $(1 - \varepsilon)A^T A - \delta I \preceq \tilde{A}^T \tilde{A} \preceq (1 + \varepsilon)A^T A + \delta I$, and the number of rows in \tilde{A} is $O(d \log(d) \log(\varepsilon \|A\|_2^2 / \delta) / \varepsilon^2)$. (Recall $A \preceq B$ means $x^T A x \leq x^T B x$ for every vector x .)

Given a set of points $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, where q_i has the coordinates $(x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,d})$, we introduce an $n \times (d + 1)$ matrix A_Q whose i th row a_i is defined as:

$$a_i = (x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,d}, 1),$$

For any two hyperplanes h_1, h_2 , they can be uniquely expressed by vectors $u^{(1)}, u^{(2)} \in \mathbb{U}^{d+1}$, and define $u = u^{(1)} - u^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, then we have $\mathbf{d}_Q(h_1, h_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|A_Q u\|$. So, if n is very large we can apply Algorithm B.1 to efficiently sample rows from A_Q , and use $A_{\tilde{Q}}$ to estimate $\mathbf{d}_Q(h_1, h_2)$. From Theorem 3 in [10], we have the following result.

Theorem B.2. *Suppose a set Q and matrix A_Q are defined as above. Let $A_{\tilde{Q}} = \text{Online-Sample}(A_Q, \varepsilon, \delta)$ be the matrix returned by Algorithm B.1. Then, with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{d+1}$, for any two hyperplanes h_1, h_2 expressed by $u^{(1)}, u^{(2)} \in \mathbb{U}^{d+1}$, suppose $u_{h_1, h_2} = u^{(1)} - u^{(2)}$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon} \left(\frac{1}{n} \|A_{\tilde{Q}} u_{h_1, h_2}\|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \delta \|u_{h_1, h_2}\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mathbf{d}_Q(h_1, h_2) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \left(\frac{1}{n} \|A_{\tilde{Q}} u_{h_1, h_2}\|^2 + \frac{1}{n} \delta \|u_{h_1, h_2}\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean norm, and with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{d+1} - e^{-(d+1)}$ the number of rows in $A_{\tilde{Q}}$ is $O(d \log(d) \log(\varepsilon \|A_Q\|_2^2 / \delta) / \varepsilon^2)$.

To make the above bound hold with arbitrarily high probability, we can use the standard median trick: run Algorithm B.1 k times in parallel to obtain $A_{\tilde{Q}_1}, \dots, A_{\tilde{Q}_k}$, then for any two hyperplanes h_1, h_2 , we take the median of $\|A_{\tilde{Q}_1} u_{h_1, h_2}\|^2, \dots, \|A_{\tilde{Q}_k} u_{h_1, h_2}\|^2$.

Remark. Since $u_{h_1, h_2} = u^{(1)} - u^{(2)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{h_1, h_2}\|^2 &= (\|u^{(1)} - u^{(2)}\|)^2 \leq (\|u^{(1)}\| + \|u^{(2)}\|)^2 \leq 2(\|u^{(1)}\|^2 + \|u^{(2)}\|^2) \\ &= 2(2 + (u_{d+1}^{(1)})^2 + (u_{d+1}^{(2)})^2) = 4 + 2\mathbf{d}^2(\mathbf{0}, h_1) + 2\mathbf{d}^2(\mathbf{0}, h_2), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{0}, h)$ is the distance from a choice of origin $\mathbf{0}$ to h . If we assume that any hyperplanes we consider must pass within a distance Δ to the choice of origin, then let $\Delta' = 4(1 + \Delta^2)$ and $\|u_{h_1, h_2}\|^2 \leq \Delta'$. Now $\mathbf{d}_{\tilde{Q}, W}(h_1, h_2)^2 = \frac{1}{n} \|A_{\tilde{Q}} u_{h_1, h_2}\|^2$ where \tilde{Q} is the set of points corresponding to rows in $A_{\tilde{Q}}$, and the weighting W is defined so $w_i = |\tilde{Q}|/n$. Then the conclusion of Theorem B.2 can be rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon} \left(\mathbf{d}_{\tilde{Q}, W}(h_1, h_2)^2 - \frac{\Delta' \delta}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mathbf{d}_Q(h_1, h_2) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \left(\mathbf{d}_{\tilde{Q}, W}(h_1, h_2)^2 + \frac{\Delta' \delta}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which means $\mathbf{d}_Q(h_1, h_2)$ can be estimated by $\mathbf{d}_{\tilde{Q}, W}(h_1, h_2)$ and the bound Δ on the distance to the origin. Recall the distance and the bound in Theorem B.2 is invariant to the choice of $\mathbf{0}$, so for this interpretation it can always be considered so Δ is small.