

# Complexity Theory of Polynomial-Time Problems

Lecture 6: 3SUM Part I

Karl Bringmann

### 3SUM

given sets A, B, C of n integers

are there  $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C$  such that a + b + c = 0?

(we assume that we can add/subtract/compare input integers in constant time)

```
trivial algorithm: O(n^3)
```

```
well-known: O(n^2)
```

Conjecture: no  $O(n^{2-\varepsilon})$  algorithm

 $\rightarrow$  3SUM-Hardness

[Gajentaan, Overmars'95]



### **More Known Algorithms**

trivial:  $O(n^3)$ well-known:  $O(n^2)$ 

using FFT:  $O(n + U \operatorname{polylog} U)$  for numbers in  $\{-U, \dots, U\}$ 

using Word RAM bit-tricks: 
$$O(n^2 \cdot \frac{\log^2 w}{w})$$
,  $O(n^2 \cdot \frac{(\log \log n)^2}{\log^2 n})$   
(cell size  $w = \Omega(\log n)$ ,  
each number fits in a cell) [Baran

[Baran, Demaine, Patrascu'05]

no bit-tricks:  $O(n^2 \cdot \frac{(\log \log n)^2}{\log n})$ 

[Gronlund,Pettie'14]

we prove a simplified version:

**Thm:** Without bit-tricks, 3SUM is in time  $O(n^2 \cdot \frac{\operatorname{poly} \log \log n}{\sqrt{\log n}})$ 



### **Equivalent Variants**

- 1) given sets A, B, C of n integers are there  $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C$  such that a + b + c = 0?
- 2) given sets *A*, *B*, *C* of *n* integers replace *C* by  $\{-c | c \in C\}$ are there  $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C$  such that a + b = c?  $\Leftrightarrow a + b - c = 0$
- 3) given sets *A*, *B*, *C* of *n* integers and target *t* replace *C* by  $\{c t \mid c \in C\}$ are there  $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C$  such that a + b + c = t?  $\Leftrightarrow a + b + (c - t) = 0$
- 4) given a set *X* of *n* integers are there  $x, y, z \in X$  such that x + y + z = 0?

 $\uparrow$ : set *A*, *B*, *C* := *X* 

max planck institut informatik

 $\downarrow: set X \coloneqq \{a + 4U \mid a \in A\} \cup B \cup \{c - 4U \mid c \in C\}$ 

where  $A, B, C \subseteq \{-U, \dots, U\}$ 

# Outline

### 1) algorithm for small universe

- 2) quadratic algorithm
- 3) small decision tree
- 4) logfactor improvement
- 5) some 3SUM-hardness results



### **Algorithm for Small Numbers**

 $O(n + U \operatorname{polylog} U)$  for numbers in  $\{-U, \dots, U\}$ 

add *U* to each number, then numbers are in  $\{0, ..., 2U\}$  and we want  $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C$  such that a + b + c = 3U

define polynomials  $p_A(x) \coloneqq \sum_{a \in A} x^a$  and similarly  $p_B(x)$ ,  $p_C(x)$ have degree at most 2U

compute  $q(x) \coloneqq p_A(x) \cdot p_B(x) \cdot p_C(x) = (\sum_{a \in A} x^a) (\sum_{b \in B} x^b) (\sum_{c \in C} x^c)$ 

what is the coefficient of  $x^{3U}$  in q(x)?  $(x^a \cdot x^b \cdot x^c = x^{a+b+c})$ it is the number of (a, b, c) summing to 3U

use efficient polynomial multiplication (via Fast Fourier Transform): polynomials of degree d can be multiplied in time  $O(d \operatorname{polylog} d)$ 



# Outline

- 1) algorithm for small universe
- 2) quadratic algorithm
- 3) small decision tree
- 4) logfactor improvement
- 5) some 3SUM-hardness results



given a set *A* of *n* integers are there *a*, *b*,  $c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

sort *A* in increasing order:  $A = \{a_1, ..., a_n\}$ 







given a set *A* of *n* integers are there *a*, *b*,  $c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

sort *A* in increasing order:  $A = \{a_1, ..., a_n\}$ 







given a set *A* of *n* integers are there *a*, *b*,  $c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

sort *A* in increasing order:  $A = \{a_1, ..., a_n\}$ 







given a set *A* of *n* integers are there *a*, *b*,  $c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

sort *A* in increasing order:  $A = \{a_1, ..., a_n\}$ 







given a set *A* of *n* integers are there *a*, *b*,  $c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

sort *A* in increasing order:  $A = \{a_1, ..., a_n\}$ 







given a set *A* of *n* integers are there *a*, *b*,  $c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

sort *A* in increasing order:  $A = \{a_1, ..., a_n\}$ 





given a set *A* of *n* integers are there  $a, b, c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

sort *A* in increasing order:  $A = \{a_1, ..., a_n\}$ 







given a set *A* of *n* integers are there *a*, *b*,  $c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

sort *A* in increasing order:  $A = \{a_1, ..., a_n\}$ 







given a set *A* of *n* integers are there *a*, *b*,  $c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

sort *A* in increasing order:  $A = \{a_1, ..., a_n\}$ 







given a set *A* of *n* integers are there *a*, *b*,  $c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

sort *A* in increasing order:  $A = \{a_1, ..., a_n\}$ 

for each  $c \in A$ : check whether there are  $a, b \in A$  s.t. a + b + c = 0



max planck institut

informatik



...

 $a_n$ 

# Outline

- 1) algorithm for small universe
- 2) quadratic algorithm
- 3) small decision tree
- 4) logfactor improvement
- 5) some 3SUM-hardness results



**Thm:** 3SUM has a decision tree of depth  $O(n^{3/2} \log n)$ 



problem P on input  $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ 

**Decision Tree:** 

each **inner node** is a **comparison**:  $x_i \le x_j$ 

more generally any linear combination:  $\sum_i \alpha_i x_i \ge 0$ 



outgoing edges are labeled 1/0 = true/false

all instances reaching the same **leaf** have the same result  $P(x_1, ..., x_n)$ 

decision tree complexity of P = minimal depth of any decision tree for P

yields a **lower bound for running time** of any algorithm (that uses only comparisons, no bit-tricks)

where you have seen this:

Thm: Any decision tree for Sorting *n* numbers has depth  $\Omega(n \log n)$ Thm: Any comparison-based Sorting algorithm takes time  $\Omega(n \log n)$ 

"experiment" or

"costly comparison"

alternative interpretation:

think of  $x_1, ..., x_n$  as physical entities we can perform **experiments**:

we may specify factors  $\alpha_i$ 

the outcome of the experiment tells us whether  $\sum_i \alpha_i x_i \ge 0$ 

experiments are very costly, computation is cheap

what is the **minimal number of experiments** to decide  $P(x_1, ..., x_n)$ ?

= decision tree complexity



alternative interpretation II:

RAM with two types of cells: **special** and **standard** input numbers  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  are stored in special cells

	special	standard
Stores:	e.g. real number	$O(\log n)$ bit number
Operations:	add, subtract, compare (result of comparison can be stored in standard cell)	all standard arithmetic and logical operations and comparisons

usual RAM cost model: each operations takes constant time

max planck institut

decision tree cost model: comparisons of special numbers cost 1 all other operations are for free

**Thm:** 3SUM has a decision tree of depth  $O(n^{3/2} \log n)$ 

why study decision tree *upper bounds*?

rules out quadratic lower bound in decision tree model

often small decision trees yield lower order improvements

**Thm:** Without bit-tricks, 3SUM is in time  $O(n^2 \cdot \frac{\operatorname{poly} \log \log n}{\sqrt{\log n}})$ 



given a set A of n integers, are there a, b,  $c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

 $O(n \log n)$  comparisons sort A in increasing order write  $A_i = \{a_{i,1}, ..., a_{i,q}\}$ partition A into n/g groups:  $A_1, \dots, A_{n/q}$ (all elements of  $A_i$  are smaller than all elements of  $A_{i+1}$ )  $O(|D|\log|D|) = O(ng\log(ng))$ sort  $D \coloneqq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n/g} A_i - A_i = \{a - b \mid \exists i : a, b \in A_i\}$ comparisons i.e., build a list  $L_D$  containing all (i, j, k) with  $i \in \{1, ..., n/g\}, j, k \in \{1, ..., g\}$ sorted by  $a_{i,i} - a_{i,k}$  ascendingly this preprocessing allows to compare any  $a_{i,i} - a_{i,k}$  and  $a_{i',i'} - a_{i',k'}$  without any costly comparisons Fredman's trick:  $a_{i,j} + a_{i',j'} \leq a_{i,k} + a_{i',k'} \iff a_{i',j'} - a_{i',k'} \leq a_{i,k} - a_{i,j}$ 

so this preprocessing allows to compare any  $a_{i,j} + a_{i',j'}$  and  $a_{i,k} + a_{i',k'}$  without any costly comparisons:

 $a_{i,j} + a_{i',j'} \leq a_{i,k} + a_{i',k'} \Leftrightarrow (i',j',k') \text{ appears before } (i,k,j) \text{ in } L_D$   $a_{i,j} + a_{i',j'} \leq a_{i,k} + a_{i',k'} \Leftrightarrow (i',j',k') \text{ appears before } (i,k,j) \text{ in } L_D$   $a_{i,j} + a_{i',j'} \leq a_{i,k} + a_{i',k'} \Leftrightarrow (i',j',k') \text{ appears before } (i,k,j) \text{ in } L_D$   $a_{i,j} + a_{i',j'} \leq a_{i,k} + a_{i',k'} \Leftrightarrow (i',j',k') \text{ appears before } (i,k,j) \text{ in } L_D$ 

given a set A of n integers, are there a, b,  $c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

sort A in increasing order $O(n \log n)$  comparisonspartition A into n/g groups:  $A_1, \dots, A_{n/g}$ <br/>(all elements of  $A_i$  are smaller than all elements of  $A_{i+1}$ )sort  $D \coloneqq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n/g} A_i - A_i = \{a - b \mid \exists i: a, b \in A_i\}$  $O(|D| \log |D|) = O(ng \log(ng))$ <br/>comparisonsfor all i, i': sort  $A_{i,i'} \coloneqq A_i + A_{i'} = \{a + b \mid a \in A_i, b \in A_{i'}\}$ no comparisons!

for each  $c \in A$ : check whether there are  $a, b \in A$  s.t. a + b + c = 0

initialize i = n/g, j = 1while i > 0 and  $j \le n/g$ : if  $-c \in A_{i,j}$ : return "solution found" if  $\min(A_i) + \max(A_j) > -c$ :  $i \coloneqq i - 1$ otherwise:  $j \coloneqq j + 1$ return "no solution"



given a set A of n integers, are there a, b,  $c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

sort A in increasing order $O(n \log n)$  comparisonspartition A into n/g groups:  $A_1, \dots, A_{n/g}$ <br/>(all elements of  $A_i$  are smaller than all elements of  $A_{i+1}$ )sort  $D \coloneqq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n/g} A_i - A_i = \{a - b \mid \exists i: a, b \in A_i\}$  $O(|D| \log |D|) = O(ng \log(ng))$ <br/>comparisonsfor all i, i': sort  $A_{i,i'} \coloneqq A_i + A_{i'} = \{a + b \mid a \in A_i, b \in A_{i'}\}$ no comparisons!

for each  $c \in A$ : check whether there are  $a, b \in A$  s.t. a + b + c = 0

initialize i = n/g, j = 1while i > 0 and  $j \le n/g$ : if  $-c \in A_{i,j}$ : return "solution found" if  $\min(A_i) + \max(A_j) > -c$ :  $i \coloneqq i - 1$ otherwise:  $j \coloneqq j + 1$ return "no solution"



given a set A of n integers, are there a, b,  $c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

sort A in increasing order $O(n \log n)$  comparisonspartition A into n/g groups:  $A_1, \dots, A_{n/g}$ <br/>(all elements of  $A_i$  are smaller than all elements of  $A_{i+1}$ )(all elements of  $A_i$  are smaller than all elements of  $A_{i+1}$ )sort  $D := \bigcup_{i=1}^{n/g} A_i - A_i = \{a - b \mid \exists i: a, b \in A_i\}$  $O(|D| \log |D|) = O(ng \log(ng))$ <br/>comparisonsfor all i, i': sort  $A_{i,i'} := A_i + A_{i'} = \{a + b \mid a \in A_i, b \in A_{i'}\}$ no comparisons!

for each  $c \in A$ : check whether there are  $a, b \in A$  s.t. a + b + c = 0

initialize i = n/g, j = 1while i > 0 and  $j \le n/g$ : if  $-c \in A_{i,j}$ : return "solution found" if  $\min(A_i) + \max(A_j) > -c$ :  $i \coloneqq i - 1$ otherwise:  $j \coloneqq j + 1$ return "no solution"

> max planck institut informatik





given a set A of n integers, are there a, b,  $c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

sort A in increasing order $O(n \log n)$  comparisonspartition A into n/g groups:  $A_1, ..., A_{n/g}$ <br/>(all elements of  $A_i$  are smaller than all elements of  $A_{i+1}$ )sort  $D := \bigcup_{i=1}^{n/g} A_i - A_i = \{a - b \mid \exists i: a, b \in A_i\}$  $O(|D| \log |D|) = O(ng \log(ng))$ <br/>comparisonsfor all i, i': sort  $A_{i,i'} := A_i + A_{i'} = \{a + b \mid a \in A_i, b \in A_{i'}\}$ no comparisons!for each  $c \in A$ :check whether there are  $a, b \in A$  s.t. a + b + c = 0n iterationsinitialize i = n/g, j = 1 $A_i = A_i + A_i = A_i$  $A_i = A_i + A_i = A_i$ 

while i > 0 and  $j \le n/g$ : if  $-c \in A_{i,j}$ : return "solution found" if  $\min(A_i) + \max(A_j) > -c$ :  $i \coloneqq i - 1$ otherwise:  $j \coloneqq j + 1$ return "no solution"  $0(\log(g^2)) = 0(\log n) \text{ comparisons}$ using binary search in total:  $0((ng + n^2/g)\log n) \text{ comparisons}$  $= 0(n^{3/2}\log n) \text{ for } g \coloneqq \sqrt{n}$ 

### **Thm:** 3SUM has a decision tree of depth $O(n^{3/2} \log n)$

# **Thm:** Without bit-tricks, 3SUM is in time $O(n^2 \cdot \frac{\operatorname{poly} \log \log n}{\sqrt{\log n}})$



# Outline

- 1) algorithm for small universe
- 2) quadratic algorithm
- 3) small decision tree
- 4) logfactor improvement
- 5) some 3SUM-hardness results



given a set A of n integers, are there a, b,  $c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

 $O(n \log n)$  comparisons sort A in increasing order and time partition A into n/g groups:  $A_1, \dots, A_{n/q}$ (all elements of  $A_i$  are smaller than all elements of  $A_{i+1}$ )  $O(|D|\log|D|) = O(ng\log(ng))$ sort  $D \coloneqq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n/g} A_i - A_i = \{a - b \mid \exists i: a, b \in A_i\}$ comparisons and time for all *i*, *i*': sort  $A_{i,i'} \coloneqq A_i + A_{i'} = \{a + b \mid a \in A_i, b \in A_{i'}\}$  no comparisons!  $O((n/q)^2 \cdot q^2 \log(q^2))$  time for each  $c \in A$ : check whether there are  $a, b \in A$  s.t. a + b + c = 0 n iterations initialize i = n/g, j = 1O(n/g) iterations while i > 0 and  $j \le n/g$ :  $O(\log(q^2)) = O(\log n)$  comparisons if  $-c \in A_{i,i}$ : return "solution found" and time using binary search if  $\min(A_i) + \max(A_i) > -c$ :  $i \coloneqq i - 1$ otherwise:  $i \coloneqq i + 1$ 

return "no solution"

max planck institut informatik in total:  $O(n^2 \log(g^2))$  time  $\cong$ 

for all *i*, *i*': sort  $A_{i,i'} := A_i + A_{i'} = \{a + b \mid a \in A_i, b \in A_{i'}\}$  write  $A_i = \{a_{i,1}, ..., a_{i,g}\}$ 

implement this step faster!

simplification:

make  $A_{i,i'}$  totally ordered: replace  $A_i$  by  $\{a_{i,j} \cdot (2g)^2 + j \mid 1 \le j \le g\}$ replace  $A_{i'}$  by  $\{a_{i',j} \cdot (2g)^2 + j \cdot (2g) \mid 1 \le j \le g\}$ 

then no  $a \in A_i$ ,  $b \in A_{i'}$  and  $a' \in A_i$ ,  $b' \in A_{i'}$  sum up to the same value

and from the new  $A_i + A_{i'}$  we can recover the old  $A_i + A_{i'}$ 



for all *i*, *i*': sort  $A_{i,i'} := A_i + A_{i'} = \{a + b \mid a \in A_i, b \in A_{i'}\}$  write  $A_i = \{a_{i,1}, ..., a_{i,g}\}$ 

consider any permutation  $P = ((\pi_1, \sigma_1), (\pi_2, \sigma_2), \dots, (\pi_{g^2}, \sigma_{g^2}))$  of  $\{1, \dots, g\} \times \{1, \dots, g\}$ 

*P* corresponds to this ordering of  $A_{i,i'}$ :

$$(a_{i,\pi_1} + a_{i',\sigma_1} \quad a_{i,\pi_2} + a_{i',\sigma_2} \quad \dots \quad a_{i,\pi_n} + a_{i',\sigma_n})$$

this is the correct sorted ordering of  $A_{i,i'}$  if and only if:

$$a_{i,\pi_k} + a_{i',\sigma_k} < a_{i,\pi_{k+1}} + a_{i',\sigma_{k+1}}$$
 for all  $1 \le k < g^2$ 

by Fredman's trick, this is equivalent to:

 $a_{i',\sigma_k} - a_{i',\sigma_{k+1}} < a_{i,\pi_{k+1}} - a_{i,\pi_k}$  for all  $1 \le k < g^2$ 

construct vectors:

$$(a_{i',\sigma_k} - a_{i',\sigma_{k+1}})_{1 \le k < g^2}$$

$$(a_{i,\pi_{k+1}} - a_{i,\pi_k})_{1 \le k < g^2}$$

we say that vector x **dominates** vector y if  $x_i > y_i$  for all i



#### **Dominance Reporting problem:**

given sets *A*, *B* of (integer-valued) vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , |A| + |B| = m

report all pairs  $a \in A, b \in B$  where b dominates a

Thm: Dominance Reporting is in time  $O(m (\log m)^d + \text{outputsize})$ 



for all *i*, *i*': sort  $A_{i,i'} := A_i + A_{i'} = \{a + b \mid a \in A_i, b \in A_{i'}\}$  write  $A_i = \{a_{i,1}, ..., a_{i,g}\}$ 

for each permutation 
$$P = ((\pi_1, \sigma_1), (\pi_2, \sigma_2), \dots, (\pi_{g^2}, \sigma_{g^2}))$$
 of  $\{1, \dots, g\} \times \{1, \dots, g\}$ :

construct sets: 
$$A = \{ (a_{i',\sigma_k} - a_{i',\sigma_{k+1}})_{1 \le k < g^2} \mid 1 \le i' \le n/g \}$$
  
 $B = \{ (a_{i,\pi_{k+1}} - a_{i,\pi_k})_{1 \le k < g^2} \mid 1 \le i \le n/g \}$ 

solve Dominance Reporting on A, B

time  $O(m (\log m)^d + \text{outputsize})$ 

for each reported pair (i, i'):

the sorted ordering of  $A_{i,i'}$  is given by *P*:

 $(a_{i,\pi_1} + a_{i',\sigma_1} \quad a_{i,\pi_2} + a_{i',\sigma_2} \quad \dots \quad a_{i,\pi_n} + a_{i',\sigma_n})$ 



for all *i*, *i*': sort  $A_{i,i'} := A_i + A_{i'} = \{a + b \mid a \in A_i, b \in A_{i'}\}$  write  $A_i = \{a_{i,1}, ..., a_{i,g}\}$ 

for each permutation  $P = ((\pi_1, \sigma_1), (\pi_2, \sigma_2), \dots, (\pi_{g^2}, \sigma_{g^2}))$  of  $\{1, \dots, g\} \times \{1, \dots, g\}$ :

construct sets: 
$$A = \{ (a_{i',\sigma_k} - a_{i',\sigma_{k+1}})_{1 \le k < g^2} \mid 1 \le i' \le n/g \}$$
  
 $B = \{ (a_{i,\pi_{k+1}} - a_{i,\pi_k})_{1 \le k < g^2} \mid 1 \le i \le n/g \}$ 

solve Dominance Reporting on *A*, *B* 

time  $O(m (\log m)^d + \text{outputsize})$ 

for each reported pair (i, i'):

the sorted ordering of  $A_{i,i'}$  is given by *P*:

 $(a_{i,\pi_1} + a_{i',\sigma_1} \quad a_{i,\pi_2} + a_{i',\sigma_2} \quad \dots \quad a_{i,\pi_n} + a_{i',\sigma_n})$ 

time for sorting all  $A_{i,i'}$ :  $O((g^2)! \cdot (n/g)(\log n/g)^{g^2} + (n/g)^2) = O((n/g)^2)$ 

setting  $g \coloneqq 0.1 \cdot \sqrt{\log n / \log \log n}$   $(g^2)! \le (g^2)^{g^2} \le (\log n)^{g^2} \le (\log n)^{(0.01 \log n) / \log \log n} = n^{0.01}$  $(\log n/g)^{g^2} \le (\log n)^{g^2} \le n^{0.01}$ 

given a set A of n integers, are there a, b,  $c \in A$  such that a + b + c = 0?

 $O(n \log n)$  comparisons sort A in increasing order and time partition A into n/g groups:  $A_1, \dots, A_{n/q}$ (all elements of  $A_i$  are smaller than all elements of  $A_{i+1}$ )  $O(|D|\log|D|) = O(ng\log(ng))$ sort  $D \coloneqq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n/g} A_i - A_i = \{a - b \mid \exists i : a, b \in A_i\}$ comparisons and time for all *i*, *i*': sort  $A_{i,i'} \coloneqq A_i + A_{i'} = \{a + b \mid a \in A_i, b \in A_{i'}\}$ no comparisons!  $O((n/g)^2 \cdot g^2 \log(g^2))$  time for each  $c \in A$ : check whether there are  $a, b \in A$  s.t. a + b + c = 0 n iterations initialize i = n/g, j = 1O(n/g) iterations while i > 0 and  $j \le n/g$ :  $O(\log(q^2)) = O(\log n)$  comparisons if  $-c \in A_{i,i}$ : return "solution found" and time using binary search if  $\min(A_i) + \max(A_i) > -c$ :  $i \coloneqq i - 1$ otherwise:  $i \coloneqq i + 1$ in total:  $O(n^2 \log(g)/g)$  time return "no solution"  $\underset{\text{informatik}}{\text{max planck institut}} \text{ for } g \coloneqq 0.1 \cdot \sqrt{\log n / \log \log n}: \quad O(n^2 \frac{\operatorname{poly} \log \log(n)}{\sqrt{\log n}}) \text{ time}$ 

### **Thm:** 3SUM has a decision tree of depth $O(n^{3/2} \log n)$

# **Thm:** Without bit-tricks, 3SUM is in time $O(n^2 \cdot \frac{\operatorname{poly} \log \log n}{\sqrt{\log n}})$



### **Dominance Reporting problem:**

given sets A, B of (integer-valued) vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , |A| + |B| = m

report all pairs  $a \in A, b \in B$  where b dominates a

**Thm:** Dominance Reporting is in time  $O(m (\log m)^d + \text{outputsize})$ 

deciding whether there is a dominating pair (a, b) is OV-hard so we do not expect an  $O(\text{poly}(d) m^{2-\varepsilon})$  algorithm

OV is in time  $O(2^d m)$ 

the theorem "generalizes" this OV-algorithm to Dominance Reporting



### **Dominance Reporting problem:**

given sets A, B of (integer-valued) vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , |A| + |B| = m

report all pairs  $a \in A, b \in B$  where b dominates a

**Thm:** Dominance Reporting is in time  $O(m (\log m)^d + \text{outputsize})$ 

assume all coordinates to be different

if d = 0: report all pairs  $A \times B$ otherwise:  $T_d(m) \le 2T_d(m/2) + T_{d-1}(m) + m$ 

find median *x* of *d*-th coordinates of all points in  $A \cup B$  - time O(m) $A_{s} \coloneqq \{a \in A \mid a_{d} < x\}$  and  $A_{I} \coloneqq A \setminus A_{s}$ 

 $B_S \coloneqq \{b \in B \mid b_d < x\} \text{ and } B_L \coloneqq B \setminus B_S$ 

max planck institut

recursively solve  $(A_L, B_L), (A_S, B_S)$ , and  $(A_S, B_L)$ 

remove *d*-th coordinates!

 $T_{d}(m) \leq 2T_{d}(m/2) + T_{d-1}(m) + m$ 

Excluding cost of output:  $T_0(m) = T_d(1) = 0$ 

Inductively prove that:  $T_d(m) \le m (\log 2m)^d - m$ 

$$\begin{split} T_d(m) &\leq 2 \left( \frac{m}{2} \; (\log m)^d - \frac{m}{2} \right) + \left( m \; (\log 2m)^{d-1} - m \right) + m \\ &= m \; ((\log 2m) - 1)^d + m \; (\log 2m)^{d-1} - m \\ &= m \; (\log 2m)^d (1 - 1/\log 2m)^d + m \; (\log 2m)^{d-1} - m \\ &\leq m \; (\log 2m)^d (1 - 1/\log 2m) + m \; (\log 2m)^{d-1} - m \\ &= m \; (\log 2m)^d - m \end{split}$$



### **Dominance Reporting problem:**

given sets A, B of (integer-valued) vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , |A| + |B| = m

report all pairs  $a \in A, b \in B$  where b dominates a

**Thm:** Dominance Reporting is in time  $O(m (\log m)^d + \text{outputsize})$ 

this finishes the proof of:

**Thm:** Without bit-tricks, 3SUM is in time  $O(n^2 \cdot \frac{\operatorname{poly} \log \log n}{\sqrt{\log n}})$ 



# Outline

- 1) algorithm for small universe
- 2) quadratic algorithm
- 3) small decision tree
- 4) logfactor improvement
- 5) some 3SUM-hardness results



### GeomBase

given a set of *n* points on three horinzontal lines y = 0, y = 1, y = 2, determine whether there exists a non-horizontal line containing three of the points

**Thm:** GeomBase is 3SUM-hard.

Given an instance (A, B, C) of 3SUM

construct points:

(a, 0) for any  $a \in A$ (b, 2) for any  $b \in B$ (c/2, 1) for any  $c \in C$ 

they lie on a line if  $c/2 - a = b - c/2 \iff a + b = c$ 

GeomBase is even equivalent to 3SUM





### **3-Points-on-line / Collinear**

given a set of n points in the plane, is there a line containing at least 3 of the points?

Thm: 3-Points-on-line is 3SUM-hard.

Given an instance A of 3SUM

construct points:

$$(a, a^3)$$
 for any  $a \in A$ 

then  $(a, a^3)$ ,  $(c, c^3)$ ,  $(c, c^3)$  are collinear if and only if a + b + c = 0(without proof)



### **3-Points-on-line / Collinear**

given a set of n possibly half-infinite, closed horizontal line segments, is there a non-horizontal separator?

Thm: Separator is 3SUM-hard.





### **Planar Motion Planning**

given a set of line segment obstacles in the plane and a line segment robot, decide whether the robot can be moved (allowing translation and rotation) from a given source to a given goal configuration without colliding with the obstacles.

Thm: PlanarMotionPlanning is 3SUM-hard.



