



HAL
open science

Randomized incremental construction of Delaunay triangulations of nice point sets

Jean-Daniel Boissonnat, Olivier Devillers, Kunal Dutta, Marc Glisse

► **To cite this version:**

Jean-Daniel Boissonnat, Olivier Devillers, Kunal Dutta, Marc Glisse. Randomized incremental construction of Delaunay triangulations of nice point sets. [Research Report] INRIA. 2019. hal-01950119v2

HAL Id: hal-01950119

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-01950119v2>

Submitted on 4 Mar 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Randomized incremental construction of Delaunay triangulations of nice point sets

Jean-Daniel Boissonnat

Université Côte d’Azur, INRIA Sophia-Antipolis, France,

jean-daniel.boissonnat@inria.fr

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1825-0097>

Olivier Devillers

INRIA, CNRS, Loria, Université de Lorraine, France

olivier.devillers@inria.fr

 [<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4275-5068>]

Kunal Dutta

Université Côte d’Azur, INRIA Sophia-Antipolis, France

kunal.dutta@inria.fr

 [orcid]

Marc Glisse

INRIA, Université Paris-Saclay, France

marc.glisse@inria.fr

 [orcid]

1 — Abstract —

2 *Randomized incremental construction* (RIC) is one of the most important paradigms for building
3 geometric data structures. Clarkson and Shor developed a general theory that led to numerous
4 algorithms that are both simple and efficient in theory and in practice.

5 Randomized incremental constructions are most of the time space and time optimal in the
6 worst-case, as exemplified by the construction of convex hulls, Delaunay triangulations and ar-
7 rangements of line segments. However, the worst-case scenario occurs rarely in practice and we
8 would like to understand how RIC behaves when the input is nice in the sense that the associated
9 output is significantly smaller than in the worst-case. For example, it is known that the Delaunay
10 triangulations of nicely distributed points in \mathbb{E}^d or on polyhedral surfaces in \mathbb{E}^3 has linear com-
11 plexity, as opposed to a worst-case complexity of $\Theta(n^{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor})$ in the first case and quadratic in the
12 second. The standard analysis does not provide accurate bounds on the complexity of such cases
13 and we aim at establishing such bounds in this paper. More precisely, we will show that, in the
14 two cases above and variants of them, the complexity of the usual RIC is $O(n \log n)$, which is
15 optimal. In other words, without any modification, RIC nicely adapts to good cases of practical
16 value.

17 Along the way, we prove a probabilistic lemma for sampling without replacement, which may
18 be of independent interest.

2012 ACM Subject Classification I.3.5 Computational Geometry and Object Modeling

Keywords and phrases Randomized incremental construction, Delaunay triangulations, Voronoi diagrams, average-case analysis, probabilistic analysis

Acknowledgements Part of this work was solved during the 16th *INRIA–McGill–Victoria Workshop on Computational Geometry* at the Bellairs Research Institute. This work is supported by the European Research Council under Advanced Grant 339025 GUDHI (Algorithmic Foundations of Geometric Understanding in Higher Dimensions).



© Jean-Daniel Boissonnat, Olivier Devillers, Kunal Dutta, & Marc Glisse;
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY

42nd Conference on Very Important Topics (CVIT 2016).

Editors: John Q. Open and Joan R. Access; Article No. 23; pp. 23:1–23:27

Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics



Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

19 **1 Introduction**

20 The *randomized incremental construction* (RIC) is an algorithmic paradigm introduced
 21 by Clarkson and Shor [12], which has since found immense applicability in computational
 22 geometry, e.g. [28, 27]. The general idea is to process the input points sequentially in a
 23 random order, and to analyze the expected complexity of the resulting procedure. The
 24 theory developed by Clarkson and Shor is quite general and led to numerous algorithms that
 25 are simple and efficient, both in theory and in practice. On the theory side, randomized
 26 incremental constructions are most of the time space and time optimal in the worst-case, as
 27 exemplified by the construction of convex hulls, Delaunay triangulations and arrangements
 28 of line segments. Randomized incremental constructions appear also to be very efficient in
 29 practice, which, together with their simplicity, make them the most popular candidates for
 30 implementations. Not surprisingly, the CGAL library includes several randomized incremental
 31 algorithms, e.g. for computing Delaunay triangulations.

32 Experimental evidence has shown that randomized incremental constructions work well
 33 beyond the worst-case, which is fortunate since worst-case situations are rare in applications.
 34 This paper aims at extending the analysis of RIC to the case of *average-case* complexity.
 35 More precisely, our goal is to understand how randomized incremental constructions behave
 36 when the input is nice in the sense that the associated construction is significantly smaller
 37 than in the worst-case.

38 We need a model of good point sets to describe the input data and analyze the algorithms.
 39 This will be done through the notion of ε -nets, which have a long and rich history since their
 40 introduction in the 1950's in the works of Kolmogorov and others on functional analysis and
 41 topological vector spaces (see e.g. [32]). ε -nets have become ubiquitous in many theoretical as
 42 well as applied areas, from geometry, functional analysis to probability theory and statistics,
 43 where they are often used as countable or finite approximations of continuous spaces.

44 When we enforce such a hypothesis of “nice” distribution of the points in space, a volume
 45 counting argument ensures that the local complexity of the Delaunay triangulation around a
 46 vertex is bounded by a constant (dependent only on the dimension).
 47

48 Unfortunately, to be able to control the complexity of the usual randomized incremental
 49 algorithms [15, 10, 12, 3], it is not enough to control the final complexity of the Delaunay
 50 triangulation. We need to control also the complexity of the triangulation of random subsets.
 51 One might expect that a random subsample of size k of an ε -net is also an ε' -net for $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}$.
 52 Actually this is not quite true, it may happen with reasonable probability that a ball of radius
 53 $O(\varepsilon')$ contains $\Omega(\log k / \log \log k)$ points or that a ball of radius $\Omega(\varepsilon' \sqrt[4]{\log k})$ does not contain
 54 any point. For the convenience of the reader, we briefly sketch the proofs in the Appendix
 55 (Lemma 45). However, it can only be shown that such a subsample is an $\left(\frac{\varepsilon'}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}\right)$ -covering
 56 and an $(\varepsilon' \log(1/\varepsilon))$ -packing, with high probability. Thus this approach can transfer the
 57 complexity of an ε -net to the one of a random subsample of an ε -net but with an extra
 58 multiplicative factor of $\Omega(\log 1/\varepsilon) = \Omega(\log n)$. It follows that, in the two cases we consider,
 59 the standard analysis does not provide accurate bounds on the complexity of the (standard)
 60 randomized incremental construction. Our results are based on proving that, *in expectation*,
 61 the above bad scenarios occur rarely, and the algorithm achieves optimal run-time complexity.
 62

63 **Related Work:** The Delaunay triangulations of nicely-distributed points have been stud-

64 ied since the 50's, e.g. in the work of Meijering [23], Gilbert [21], Miles [24] Møller [26],
 65 Golin-Na [22], for Poisson-distributed points, Dwyer [17, 16] for uniformly distributed points,
 66 Attali-Boissonnat [4], Attali-Boissonnat-Lieutier [5], Amenta-Attali-Devillers [2], and others
 67 for (ε, κ) -samples, and Erickson [18, 19] for points with bounded spread (the ratio between
 68 the maximum to minimum distance between any two points). Except for a few authors such
 69 as Dwyer [17] and Erickson [19], most of the above results discuss only the combinatorial
 70 aspects and not the algorithmic ones. For Poisson and uniformly distributed point samples,
 71 we observe that the standard analysis of the RIC procedure immediately implies a bound on
 72 the expected run-time, of the order of the expected number of simplices times a logarithmic
 73 factor, which is optimal. However, for deterministic notions of nice distributions such as ε
 74 nets, (ε, κ) samples, and bounded spread point sets, the standard RIC analysis is not optimal,
 75 since, as we observed, it gives at least an extra logarithmic factor for (ε, κ) samples and even
 76 worse for bounded spread point-sets, as stated in an open problem by Erickson [19]. Miller,
 77 Sheehy and Velingker [25] follow a very different approach, giving an algorithm to compute
 78 the approximate Delaunay graph of a nicely-spaced superset of points for an arbitrary input
 79 point-set, with optimal time complexity and a $2^{O(d)}$ -dependence on the dimension. However
 80 their algorithm is quite complicated and uses several subroutines that have varying difficulties
 81 of implementation. The RIC, while having a worse $2^{O(d^2)}$ dependence on the dimension
 82 (which Miller et al. observe, may be impossible to avoid for computing the exact Delaunay
 83 graph), computes the entire Delaunay triangulation of the given point set rather than a
 84 superset, is easy to implement and works efficiently in practice.

85

86 **Our contribution:** We consider two main questions in this paper. First, we consider the
 87 case of an ε -net in the periodic space of dimension d , which, as mentioned before, have linear
 88 complexity instead of the worst-case $\Theta(n^{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor})$. The reason to consider a periodic space is to
 89 avoid dealing with boundary effects that would distract us from the main point, and the fact
 90 that periodic spaces are often used in practice, e.g. in simulations in astronomy, biomedical
 91 computing, solid-state chemistry, condensed matter physics, etc. [11, 13, 29, 20, 33]. Following
 92 this, we deal with ε -nets on a polyhedral surface of \mathbb{E}^3 , which is also a commonly-occurring
 93 practical scenario in e.g. surface reconstruction [1, 8], and has Delaunay triangulations with
 94 linear, as opposed to the worst-case quadratic, complexity. In this case, the boundary effects
 95 need to be explicitly controlled, which requires a more careful handling along with some new
 96 ideas. In both cases, we establish tight bounds and show that the complexity of the usual
 97 RIC is $O(n \log n)$, which is optimal. Hence, without any modification, the standard RIC
 98 nicely adapts to the good cases above.

99 Our technical developments rely on a general bound for the probability of certain non-
 100 monotone events in sampling without replacement, which may be of independent interest.

101

102 **Extensions** We also give some extensions of our results for periodic spaces. Our extensions
 103 are in four directions: (i) a more general notion of well-distributed point sets, the (ε, κ)
 104 samples (ii) a different notion of subsampling - the Bernoulli or i.i.d. sample where each
 105 point is selected to be in \mathcal{Y} independently of the others, with probability $q = s/n$, (iii) a
 106 more general class of spaces - Euclidean d -orbifolds, and (iv) a more general class of metrics
 107 - those having bounded-distortion with respect to the Euclidean metric. Precisely, for all
 108 the above cases, we show that the Delaunay triangulation of a random subsample has a
 109 linear size in expectation. We believe that our methods should work for an even larger class
 110 of spaces, though this might require more delicate handling of boundary effects and other
 111 features specific to the metric space under consideration.

112

113 **Outline** The rest of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we define the basic concepts
 114 of Delaunay triangulation, ε -net, flat torus and random samples. We state our results in
 115 Section 3. In Section 4, we bound the size of the Delaunay triangulation of a uniform random
 116 sample of a given size extracted from an ε -net on the flat torus \mathbb{T}^d . In Section 5, we analyse
 117 the case when the uniform random subsample is drawn from an ε -net on a polyhedral surface
 118 in \mathbb{E}^3 . In Section 6, we use the size bounds established in Sections 4 and 5, to compute
 119 the space and time complexity of the randomized incremental construction for constructing
 120 Delaunay triangulations of ε -nets. Finally, in Section 7, we state and prove some extensions.
 121 Proofs missing from the main sections are given in the Appendix.

122 2 Background

123 2.1 Notations

124 We denote by $\Sigma(p, r)$, $B(p, r)$ and $B[p, r]$, the sphere, the open ball, and the closed ball of
 125 center p and radius r respectively. For $x \in \mathbb{E}^2$, $y \geq 0$, $D(x, r)$ denotes the disk with center
 126 x and radius r , i.e. the set of points $\{y \in \mathbb{E}^2 : \|y - x\| < r\}$, and similarly $D[x, r]$ denotes
 127 the corresponding closed disk. The volume of the unit Euclidean ball of dimension d is
 128 denoted V_d and the area of the boundary of such a ball is denoted S_{d-1} . It is known that
 129 $V_d = \frac{\pi^{\frac{d}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{d}{2}+1)}$ and $S_d = 2\pi V_{d-1}$, where $\Gamma(t) := \int_0^\infty e^{-x} x^{t-1} dx$, ($t > 0$) denotes the *Gamma*
 130 *function*. For $d \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\Gamma(d+1) = d!$. We note that $2^d d^{-d/2} \leq V_d \leq 2^{4d} d^{-d/2}$ (see e.g. [34]).

131

132 For an event \mathcal{E} in some probability space Ω , we use $\mathbf{1}_{[\mathcal{E}]}$ to denote the indicator variable
 133 $\mathbf{1}_{[\mathcal{E}]} = \mathbf{1}_{[\mathcal{E}]}(\omega)$ which is 1 whenever $\omega \in \mathcal{E}$, and zero otherwise. We use $[n]$ to mean the
 134 set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Given a discrete set A , $\#(A)$ denotes its cardinality and, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\binom{A}{k}$
 135 denotes the set of k -sized subsets of A . Given an event A in some probability space, $\mathbb{P}[A]$
 136 denotes the probability of A occurring. For a random variable Z in a probability space, $\mathbb{E}[Z]$
 137 denotes the expected value of Z . Lastly, $e = 2.7182\dots$ denotes the base of the natural
 138 logarithm.

139 2.2 ε -nets

140 A set \mathcal{X} of n points in a metric space \mathcal{M} , is an ε -packing if any pair of points in \mathcal{X} are at
 141 least distance ε apart, and an ε -cover if each point in \mathcal{M} is at distance at most ε from some
 142 point of \mathcal{X} . \mathcal{X} is an ε -net if it is an ε -cover and an ε -packing simultaneously.

143 The definition of an ε -net applies for any metric space. In the case of the Euclidean
 144 metric, we can prove some additional properties. We shall use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote the Euclidean ℓ_2
 145 norm. The following lemmas are folklore.

146 ► **Lemma 1** (Maximum packing size). *Any packing of the ball of radius $r \geq \rho$ in dimension d
 147 by disjoint balls of radius $\rho/2$ has a number of balls smaller than $\left(\frac{3r}{\rho}\right)^d$.*

148 **Proof.** Consider a maximal set of disjoint balls of radius $\frac{\rho}{2}$ with center inside the ball $B(r)$
 149 of radius r . Then the balls with the same centers and radius ρ cover the ball $B(r)$ (otherwise
 150 it contradicts the maximality). By a volume argument we get that the number of balls is
 151 bounded from above by $\frac{V_d \times \left(r + \frac{\rho}{2}\right)^d}{V_d \times \left(\frac{\rho}{2}\right)^d} \leq \left(\frac{3r}{\rho}\right)^d$. ◀

152 ► **Lemma 2** (Minimum cover size). *Any covering of a ball of radius r in dimension d by balls*
 153 *of radius ρ has a number of balls greater than $\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^d$.*

154 **Proof.** The volume argument gives a lower bound of $\frac{V_d \times r^d}{V_d \times \rho^d} = \left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^d$. ◀

155 For $d \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, the *flat d -torus* \mathbb{T}^d is the compact quotient group $\mathbb{E}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$, with addition as
 156 the group action. More generally, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, the flat torus of length k is $\mathbb{T}_k^d := \mathbb{E}^d/(k\mathbb{Z})^d$.

157 ► **Lemma 3** (ε -net size bounds). *Given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$, let \mathcal{X} be an ε -net over the flat torus \mathbb{T}^d .*
 158 *Then, $\#\mathcal{X} \in [d^{d/2}2^{-4d} \cdot \varepsilon^{-d}, d^{d/2}\varepsilon^{-d}]$.*

159 **Proof.** Observe that, by the minimum distance property of the points in \mathcal{X} , the balls of radius
 160 $\varepsilon/2$ centered around each point in \mathcal{X} are disjoint, and by a volume argument there can be at
 161 most $\frac{1}{V_d \times (\varepsilon/2)^d} \leq 2^{-d}d^{d/2}(\varepsilon/2)^{-d} = d^{d/2}\varepsilon^{-d}$ such balls in \mathbb{T}^d . The balls of radius ε centered
 162 around each point in \mathcal{X} cover the space thus their number is at least $\frac{1}{V_d \times \varepsilon^d} \geq d^{d/2}2^{-4d} \cdot \varepsilon^{-d}$.
 163 This completes the proof of the lemma. ◀

164 2.3 Delaunay triangulation

165 For simplicity of exposition and no real loss of generality, all finite point sets considered
 166 in this paper will be assumed to be in *general position*, i.e. no set of $d + 2$ points lie on a
 167 sphere. Given a set \mathcal{X} in some ambient topological space, the *Delaunay complex* of \mathcal{X} is the
 168 (abstract) simplicial complex with vertex set \mathcal{X} which is the nerve of the Voronoi diagram of
 169 \mathcal{X} , that is, a simplex σ (of arbitrary dimension) belongs to $Del(\mathcal{X})$ iff the Voronoi cells of its
 170 vertices have a non empty common intersection. Equivalently, σ can be circumscribed by an
 171 empty ball, i.e. a ball whose bounding sphere contains the vertices of σ and whose interior
 172 contains no points of \mathcal{X} .

173 The Delaunay complex is a triangulation if it triangulates the ambient space, or more
 174 precisely, the Delaunay complex $Del(\mathcal{X})$ of a point set \mathcal{X} over an ambient space \mathcal{M} , is said
 175 to be a *Delaunay triangulation* of \mathcal{M} if there exists a homeomorphism between $Del(\mathcal{X})$ and
 176 \mathcal{M} . Given a set \mathcal{X} in some ambient space \mathcal{M} , with its Delaunay complex $Del(\mathcal{X})$, the *star*
 177 of a subset $S \in \mathcal{X}$, or *star*(S), is the set of all simplices in $Del(\mathcal{X})$ which are incident to at
 178 least one point in S . For a point $p \in \mathcal{X}$, we shall use the shorthand expression *star*(p) to
 179 mean *star*($\{p\}$). Given topological spaces \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{C} , and a continuous map $\pi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$, \mathcal{C} is a
 180 *covering space* of \mathcal{S} if π is such that for every point $x \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists an open neighbourhood
 181 U of x , such that the pre-image $\pi^{-1}(U)$ is a disjoint union of open neighbourhoods in \mathcal{C} ,
 182 each of which is homeomorphically mapped onto U by π . A covering \mathcal{C} of \mathcal{S} is *m -fold* or
 183 *m -sheeted* if the cardinality of the pre-image of each point $x \in \mathcal{S}$ under the covering map is
 184 m .

185 For example, \mathbb{T}_k^d forms a k^d -sheeted *covering space* of \mathbb{T}^d , with the covering map $x \mapsto x$
 186 mod 1, the modulus operation being defined coordinate-wise. Caroli and Teillaud [11] showed

187 ► **Theorem 4** (Caroli-Teillaud [11]). *The Delaunay complex of any finite point set in \mathbb{T}^d*
 188 *having at least 1 point, embeds in the 3^d -sheeted covering of \mathbb{T}^d . If the maximum circumradius*
 189 *of a simplex is at most $1/2$, then the complex embeds in \mathbb{T}^d itself.*

190 Note that the above theorem implies that the Delaunay triangulation of any finite point
 191 set in \mathbb{T}^d *always exists* in the 3^d -sheeted covering of \mathbb{T}^d .

192

193 A key property of ε -nets is that their Delaunay triangulations have linear size.

194 ► **Lemma 5** (Talmor [30]). *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$ be given, and let \mathcal{X} be an ε -net over \mathbb{T}^d . Then*
 195 *the Delaunay triangulation of \mathcal{X} , $Del(\mathcal{X})$ has at most $4^{d^2} \varepsilon^{-d}$ simplices.*

196 **Proof.** Observe that the circumradius of any simplex in $Del(\mathcal{X})$ cannot be greater than
 197 ε , since this would imply the existence of a ball in \mathbb{T}^d of radius at least ε , containing
 198 no points from \mathcal{X} . Therefore given a point $p \in \mathcal{X}$, any point which lies in a Delaunay
 199 simplex incident to p , must be at most distance 2ε from p . Again by a volume argument,
 200 the number of such points is at most $\frac{V_d \times (2\varepsilon + \varepsilon/2)^d}{V_d \times ((\varepsilon/2)^d)} = 5^d$. Thus, the number of Delaunay
 201 simplices of dimension at most d that contain p , is at most the complexity of the Delaunay
 202 triangulation in \mathbb{T}^d on 5^d vertices. This is at most $(5^d)^{\lceil d/2 \rceil}$. Thus we can conclude that
 203 the number of simplices in $Del(\mathcal{X})$ is at most the cardinality of \mathcal{X} , times the maximum
 204 number of simplices incident to any given point $p \in \mathcal{X}$. Now using Lemma 3, we get that
 205 $(5^d)^{\lceil d/2 \rceil} \cdot \#\mathcal{X} \leq (5^d)^{\frac{d+1}{2}} d^{d/2} \varepsilon^{-d} \leq 4^{d^2} \varepsilon^{-d}$. ◀

206 **2.4 Randomized incremental construction and random subsamples**

207 For the algorithmic complexity aspects, we state a version of a standard theorem for the
 208 RIC procedure, (see e.g. [14]). We first need a necessary condition for the theorem. When a
 209 new point p is added to an existing triangulation, a *conflict* is defined to be a previously
 210 existing simplex whose circumball contains p .

211 ► **Condition 6.** *At each step of the RIC, the set of simplices in conflict can be removed and*
 212 *the set of newly introduced conflicts computed in time proportional to the number of conflicts.*

213 We now come to the general theorem on the algorithmic complexity of RIC using the
 214 Clarkson-Shor technique (see e.g. Devillers [14] Theorem 5(1,2)).

215 ► **Theorem 7.** *Let $F(s)$ denote the expected number of simplices that appear in the Delaunay*
 216 *triangulation of a uniform random sample of size s , from a given point set P . Then, if*
 217 *Condition 6 holds and $F(s) = O(s)$, we have*

- 218 (i) *The expected space complexity of computing the Delaunay triangulation is $O(n)$.*
 219 (ii) *The expected time complexity of computing the Delaunay triangulation is $\sum_{s=1}^n \frac{n-s}{s} =$*
 220 *$O(n \log n)$.*

221 A subset \mathcal{Y} of set \mathcal{X} is a *uniform random sample* of \mathcal{X} of size s if \mathcal{Y} is any possible subset
 222 of \mathcal{X} of size s with equal probability. In case the multiplicity of a point in \mathcal{X} is greater than
 223 1, the sample counts only one copy of the point; all other copies are present in \mathcal{Y} if and only
 224 if the original point is present.

225 In order to work with uniform random samples, we shall prove a lemma on the uniformly
 226 random sampling distribution or *sampling without replacement*, which is stated below, and
 227 will be a key probabilistic component of our proofs. The lemma provides a bound on the
 228 probability of a non-monotone compound event, that is, if the event holds true for a fixed
 229 set of k points, there could exist supersets as well as subsets of the chosen set for which the
 230 event does not hold. This may well be of general interest, as most natural contiguity results
 231 with Bernoulli (i.e. independent) sampling, are for monotone events.

232 ► **Lemma 8.** *Given $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, with $2b \leq a \leq c$, $t \leq c$. Let C be a set, and B and T two*
 233 *disjoint subsets of C . If A is a random subset of C , chosen uniformly from all subsets*
 234 *of C having size a , the probability that A contains B and is disjoint from T , is at most*
 235 $\left(\frac{a}{c}\right)^b \left(1 - \frac{t}{c-b}\right)^{a-b} \leq \left(\frac{a}{c}\right)^b \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{at}{2c}\right)$, *where a, b, c are the cardinalities of A, B , and C*
 236 *respectively, and the cardinality of T is at least t .*

237 **Proof.** The total number of ways of choosing the random sample A is $\binom{c}{a}$. The number
 238 of ways of choosing A such that $B \subset A$ and $T \cap A = \emptyset$, is $\binom{c-b-t}{a-b}$. Therefore the required
 239 probability is

$$\begin{aligned}
 240 \quad \mathbb{P}[B \subset A, T \cap A = \emptyset] &= \frac{\binom{c-b-t}{a-b}}{\binom{c}{a}} \\
 241 &= \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{b-1} (a-i) \prod_{i=b}^{a-1} (a-i)}{\prod_{i=0}^{b-1} (c-i) \prod_{i=b}^{a-1} (c-i)} \cdot \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{a-b-1} (c-b-t-i)}{\prod_{i=0}^{a-b-1} (a-b-i)} \\
 242 &= \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{b-1} (a-i) \prod_{i=0}^{a-b-1} (c-b-t-i)}{\prod_{i=0}^{b-1} (c-i) \prod_{i=0}^{a-b-1} (c-b-i)} \\
 243 &= (a/c)^b \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{b-1} (1-i/a)}{\prod_{i=0}^{b-1} (1-i/c)} \left(1 - \frac{t}{c-b}\right)^{a-b} \left(\frac{\prod_{i=0}^{a-b-1} (1 - \frac{i}{c-b-t})}{\prod_{i=0}^{a-b-1} (1 - \frac{i}{c-b})}\right) \\
 244 &\leq (a/c)^b \left(1 - \frac{t}{c-b}\right)^{a-b},
 \end{aligned}$$

245 where in the last step, observe that for the product $\frac{\prod_{i=0}^{b-1} (1-i/a)}{\prod_{i=0}^{b-1} (1-i/c)}$ for each i , the term $(1-i/a)$
 246 in the numerator is smaller than the corresponding term $(1-i/c)$ in the denominator, since
 247 $a \leq c$. A similar observation holds for the product $\left(\frac{\prod_{i=0}^{a-b-1} (1 - \frac{i}{c-b-t})}{\prod_{i=0}^{a-b-1} (1 - \frac{i}{c-b})}\right)$.

248 Now, observe that $\left(1 - \frac{t}{c-b}\right)^{a-b} \leq \exp\left(-\left(\frac{t(a-b)}{c-b}\right)\right) \leq \exp\left(-\left(\frac{at}{2c}\right)\right)$, if $b \leq a/2$ and
 249 $b < c$. ◀

250 3 Results

251 **Random samples of ε -nets in \mathbb{T}^d :** The following theorem gives a constant bound on the
 252 expected size of $star(p)$ for the Euclidean metric on the flat torus \mathbb{T}^d .

253 ▶ **Theorem 9** (Euclidean metric). *Given an ε -net \mathcal{X} in \mathbb{T}^d in general position, where $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$,
 254 the expected number of simplices incident to a point $p \in \mathcal{X}$, $\mathbb{E}[\sharp(star(p))]$ in the Delaunay
 255 triangulation of a uniform random sample $S \subset \mathcal{X}$ of size $s \geq 4(2\sqrt{d})^d d^3 + 1$ containing p , is
 256 less than $2 \cdot 6^{d^2+d}$.*

257 **Polyhedral Surfaces in \mathbb{E}^3 :** A polyhedral surface \mathcal{S} in \mathbb{E}^3 is a collection of a finite number
 258 of polygons $F \subset \mathcal{S}$, called *facets*, which are pairwise disjoint or meet along an edge. In this
 259 paper, \mathcal{S} will denote an arbitrary but fixed polyhedral surface, with \mathcal{C} facets, and having
 260 total length of the boundaries of its faces L and total area of its faces A .

261 We show that the expected complexity of the Delaunay triangulation of a uniformly
 262 random subsample of an ε -net on a polyhedral surface is linear in the size of the subsample:

263 ▶ **Theorem 10.** *Let $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, \mathcal{X} be an ε -net on a polyhedral surface \mathcal{S} , having n points and
 264 let $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathcal{X}$ be a random sub-sample of \mathcal{X} having size s . Then the Delaunay triangulation
 265 $Del(\mathcal{Y})$ of \mathcal{Y} on \mathcal{S} has $O(s)$ simplices.*

266 **Algorithmic Bounds:** We next use the above combinatorial bounds to get the space and
 267 time complexity of the randomized incremental construction of the Delaunay triangulation
 268 of an ε -net on the flat d -torus or on a polyhedral surface in \mathbb{E}^3 .

269 ▶ **Theorem 11** (Randomized incremental construction). *Let $\varepsilon \in [0, 1/4]$, and let \mathcal{X} be an
 270 ε -net in general position over (i) the flat d -dimensional torus \mathbb{T}^d , or (ii) a fixed polyhedral*

271 surface $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{E}^3$, then the randomized incremental construction of the Delaunay triangulation
 272 takes $O(n \log n)$ expected time and $O(n)$ expected space, where $n = \sharp(\mathcal{X})$ and the constant in
 273 the big O depends only on d , and not on n or ε . Further, at each step of the randomized
 274 incremental construction, the Delaunay complex of the set \mathcal{Y} of already added points of \mathcal{X} is
 275 a triangulation of the space.

276 **Extensions:** Finally, our extensions are stated and proved in Section 7.

277 4 Euclidean Metric on \mathbb{T}^d

278 In this section, we prove that a subsample \mathcal{Y} of a given size s , drawn randomly from an ε -net
 279 $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{T}^d$, has a Delaunay triangulation in which the star of any given vertex has a constant
 280 expected complexity. Hence, the expected complexity of the triangulation is linear in the size
 281 of the subsample. The constant of proportionality is bounded by 2^{cd^2} , where c is a constant
 282 independent of ε and d .

283 Existence of Delaunay triangulation $Del(\mathcal{Y})$

284 In order to ensure we always have the Delaunay complex embedded in \mathbb{T}^d , we shall use
 285 Theorem 4. Accordingly, we get two different regimes of the potential simplices in the
 286 triangulation. When the circumradius of a potential simplex $\sigma \in star(p)$ is at most $1/4$,
 287 then the simplex lies in a ball of radius at most $1/2$ with center p . By Theorem 4, in this
 288 regime the Delaunay complex $star(p)$ embeds in the one-sheeted covering of \mathbb{T}^d . Therefore,
 289 for a fixed set of vertices, there is a unique circumball. When the circumradius is greater
 290 than $1/4$, the simplex is contained in a ball of radius $> 1/2$ around p , and therefore $star(p)$
 291 embeds in the 3^d -sheeted covering of \mathbb{T}^d , i.e. \mathbb{T}_3^d . In this case, each vertex has 3^d copies, and
 292 so for a given choice of d vertices together with p , one can have $(3^d)^d$ circumballs.

293 Proof Framework

294 Now we set up the formal proof. Recall that $n := \sharp(\mathcal{X})$. Define $q := \frac{s-1}{n-1}$. Define
 295 $\delta := \varepsilon \cdot \left(\frac{2d}{q}\right)^{1/d}$. Let $I_0 := [0, \delta)$, $I_k := [2^{k-1}\delta, 2^k\delta)$ for $k > 0$. To bound the expected
 296 complexity, we shall consider the probability of existence of potential d -simplices in \mathcal{X} ,
 297 incident to p and having radius in the intervals I_k , as k ranges over \mathbb{Z}^+ .

298 Throughout this section, we shall use σ to mean a d -simplex incident to p , with cir-
 299 cumcentre c_σ and circumradius r_σ , and τ to mean the set of vertices of $\sigma \setminus \{p\}$. To count
 300 the number of simplices in $star(p)$ with circumradius in I_k , let $S_p(k)$ denote the set of
 301 possible $(d-1)$ -simplices with vertices in \mathcal{X} , such that for every $\tau \in S_p(k)$, the d -simplex
 302 $\sigma := \tau \cup \{p\}$ has circumradius $r_\sigma \in I_k$. Set $s_p(k) := \sharp(S_p(k))$. Let n_k denote the min-
 303 imum number of points of \mathcal{X} in the interior of the circumball of σ , over all $\tau \in S_p(k)$:
 304 $n_k := \min_{\tau \in S_p(k)} \{\sharp(B(c_\sigma, r_\sigma) \cap \mathcal{X}) : \sigma = \tau \cup \{p\}\}$. For $\tau \in S_p(k)$, let $P_p(k)$ denote an
 305 upper bound on the probability that $\sigma = \tau \cup \{p\}$ appears in $Del(\mathcal{Y})$, that is,

$$306 \quad P_p(k) := \max_{\tau \in S_p(k)} \{\mathbb{P}[\sigma \in Del(\mathcal{Y})]\}.$$

307 Finally, let $Z_p(k)$ denote the number of simplices $\tau \in S_p(k)$ such that $\sigma \in Del(\mathcal{Y})$. The main
 308 lemma in the proof is a bound on the expected complexity of the star of p , in terms of $s_p(k)$
 309 and $P_p(k)$.

310 **► Lemma 12.** $\mathbb{E}[\sharp(star(p))] \leq \sum_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[Z_p(k)] \leq \sum_{k \geq 0} s_p(k) \cdot P_p(k)$.

311 **Proof.** For a simplex $\sigma = \tau \cup \{p\}$, with the vertex set of τ in $S_p(k)$, let $\mathbf{1}_{[\tau]}$ be the indicator
 312 random variable which is 1 if $\sigma \in \text{star}(p)$, and zero otherwise. Then $Z_p(k) := \sum_{\tau \in S_p(k)} \mathbf{1}_{[\tau]}$,
 313 and $\sharp(\text{star}(p)) = \sum_{k \geq 0} Z_p(k)$.

314 Taking expectations over the random sample \mathcal{Y} , we get

$$\begin{aligned} 315 \quad \mathbb{E}[\sharp(\text{star}(p))] &= \sum_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[Z_p(k)] \\ 316 &= \sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{\tau \in S_p(k)} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{[\tau]}] \leq \sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{\tau \in S_p(k)} P_d(k) = \sum_{k \geq 0} s_p(k) \cdot P_d(k). \end{aligned}$$

317 ◀

318 It only remains, therefore, to establish bounds on $s_p(k)$ and $P_p(k)$ as functions of k , and
 319 finally to bound the sum $\sum_{k \geq 0} s_p(k) \cdot P_p(k)$.

320 Following the earlier discussion on the existence of the Delaunay triangulation $\text{Del}(\mathcal{Y})$,
 321 we shall split the sum $\sum_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[Z_p(k)]$ into the two regimes, $0 \leq k \leq k_{\max}$, and $k > k_{\max}$,
 322 where k_{\max} denotes $\log_2 \frac{1}{4\delta}$.

323 **Case I: Simplices with small circumradii** $k \in [0, k_{\max}]$

324 In this regime, the circumradii r_σ of the potential simplices, are at most $1/4$, since recall that
 325 by the definition of k_{\max} , we have $r_\sigma \leq 2^{k_{\max}} \delta = 1/4$. Therefore every set of $d + 1$ vertices in
 326 \mathcal{Y} , has a unique circumball. We begin by establishing a bound on $P_p(k)$. First, we bound n_k
 327 from below using Lemma 2.

328 ▶ **Lemma 13.** *Let σ be a simplex incident to p , having circumradius $r_\sigma \in I_k$, $k \geq 0$.*

$$329 \quad n_k \geq \begin{cases} 0 & k = 0. \\ \left(\frac{2^{k-1}\delta}{\varepsilon}\right)^d & 0 < k \leq k_{\max}. \end{cases}$$

330 **Proof.** When $k \leq k_{\max}$, the radius of the circumball of a simplex $\sigma = \tau \cup \{p\}$, $\tau \in S_p(k)$, is
 331 at most $2^{k_{\max}} \delta \leq 1/4 < 1/2$. Applying Theorem 4, we work in the one-sheeted covering of
 332 \mathbb{T}^d . Using the fact that \mathcal{X} is an ε -covering, we apply Lemma 2 to get that $n_k \geq (2^{k-1}\delta/\varepsilon)^d$.
 333 ◀

334 Now applying Lemma 8, we can bound $P_p(k)$.

335 ▶ **Lemma 14.** *For $k \geq 0$, $P_p(k) \leq q^d \cdot \exp(-qn_k/2)$.*

336 **Proof.** The simplex σ can be a Delaunay simplex only if (i) the set of its vertices is included
 337 in the subsample \mathcal{Y} , and (ii) all points in $B(c_\sigma, r_\sigma) \cap \mathcal{X}$ are excluded from \mathcal{Y} . The idea is
 338 therefore, to use Lemma 13 to bound the number of points in $B(c_\sigma, r_\sigma) \cap \mathcal{X}$ from below by
 339 n_k , and then upper-bound the probability that all these points are excluded from \mathcal{Y} .

340 This suggests applying Lemma 8, with the universe having $c = n - 1$ elements, sample
 341 size $a = s - 1$, included set having $b = d$ elements, and excluded set having $t = n_k$ elements.
 342 We verify first that the conditions of the lemma are satisfied, i.e. (i) $b \leq \min\{\frac{a}{2}, c - 1\}$, since
 343 $s \geq 4d + 1$. Now applying the lemma, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 344 \quad \mathbb{P}[\sigma \in \text{Del}(\mathcal{Y})] &\leq \left(\frac{s-1}{n-1}\right)^d \exp\left(-n_k \cdot \left(\frac{s-1}{2(n-1)}\right)\right) \\ 345 &= q^d \cdot \exp(-qn_k/2) \leq q^d \cdot \exp(-qn_k/2), \end{aligned}$$

346 where the equality was by the substitution $q = \frac{s-1}{n-1}$, and the last inequality followed from
 347 the fact that $d = b \leq c - 1 = n - 2$. ◀

23:10 RIC of Delaunay triangulations of nice point sets

348 Next, we shall upper bound $s_p(k)$ from above. We first state a simple observation.

349 ► **Lemma 15.** *Let σ be a d -simplex incident to p , with circumcentre c_σ and circumradius*
 350 *r_σ . Then $\sigma \subset B[p, 2r_\sigma]$ and $B(c_\sigma, r_\sigma) \subset B(p, 2r_\sigma)$.*

351 **Proof.** This follows simply from the triangle inequality. For the first statement, we have that
 352 for any $p' \in \sigma$, $\|p, p'\| \leq \|p, c_\sigma\| + \|c_\sigma, p'\| = 2r_\sigma$. The second statement follows by replacing
 353 the above inequalities with strict inequalities for the points in the open ball $B(c_\sigma, r_\sigma)$. ◀

354 Now we can bound $s_p(k)$ using the above observation together with Lemma 1.

355 ► **Lemma 16.** *For $k \geq 0$, $s_p(k) \leq \frac{(6 \cdot 2^k \delta / \varepsilon)^{d^2}}{d!}$.*

356 **Proof.** Let τ be an element of $S_p(k)$. Using Lemma 15 and the definition of $S_p(k)$, we
 357 have that $\sigma = \tau \cup \{p\} \subset B[p, 2^{k+1}\delta]$. If $k \leq k_{\max}$, then $2^{k+1}\delta \leq 1/2$. Therefore applying
 358 Theorem 4, we can work in the one-sheeted covering of \mathbb{T}^d . Now applying Lemma 1, the
 359 number of points in $B(p, 2^{k+1}\delta) \cap \mathcal{X}$ is at most $(3 \cdot 2^{k+1}\delta/\varepsilon)^d = (6 \cdot 2^k \delta/\varepsilon)^d$. Therefore, the
 360 set of possible simplices incident to p and having vertices in $B[p, 2^{k+1}\delta] \cap \mathcal{X}$ is at most the
 361 set of all d -tuples of points in $B[p, 2^{k+1}\delta] \cap \mathcal{X}$, i.e. at most $(6 \cdot 2^k \delta/\varepsilon)^{d^2}/d!$. ◀

362 Next, using the above bounds on $s_p(k)$ and n_k , we shall bound the sum $\sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}} \mathbb{E}[Z_p(k)]$
 363 in the following three lemmas.

364 ► **Lemma 17.** $\mathbb{E}[Z_p(0)] \leq 6^{d^2+d}$.

365 **Proof.** Substituting the bounds on $s_p(0)$ and $P_p(0)$ proved in Lemmas 16, 14 and 13
 366 respectively, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 367 \quad \mathbb{E}[Z_p(0)] &= s_p(0) \cdot P_p(0) \\ 368 \quad &= \frac{(6(\delta/\varepsilon))^{d^2}}{d!} \cdot q^d \leq \frac{6^{d^2} \cdot (2d)^d}{d!} \leq 6^{d^2} \cdot (2e)^d, \end{aligned}$$

369 where in the second step we used the definition of δ to get $q(\delta/\varepsilon)^d = 2d$, and in the last step
 370 we used Stirling's approximation $d^d/d! \leq e^d$, and that $2e < 6$. ◀

371 ► **Lemma 18.** $\sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}} \mathbb{E}[Z_p(k)] \leq (1 - (2/e)^6)^{-1} \cdot 6^{d^2+d}$.

372 **Proof.** First, recall from Lemma 12 that $\sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbb{E}[Z_p(k)] \leq \sum_{k \geq 0} s_p(k) \cdot P_p(k)$. Now from
 373 Lemmas 14, 13 and 16, we have that for all $k \geq 0$,

374 (i) $s_p(k) \leq \tilde{s}_p(k) := (6 \cdot 2^k \delta/\varepsilon)^{d^2}/d!$ and

375 (ii) $P_p(k) \leq \tilde{P}_p(k) := \begin{cases} q^d, & k = 0 \\ q^d \cdot \exp(-q(2^{k-1}\delta/\varepsilon)^d/2), & k \in [1, k_{\max}] \end{cases}$.

376 Observe that $\sum_{k \geq 0} s_p(k) \cdot P_p(k) \leq \sum_{k \geq 0} \tilde{s}_p(k) \cdot \tilde{P}_p(k)$. In order to bound $\sum_{k \geq 0} s_p(k) \cdot P_p(k)$,
 377 it therefore suffices to simply bound $\sum_{k \geq 0} \tilde{s}_p(k) \cdot \tilde{P}_p(k)$. For the rest of the proof therefore,
 378 we shall focus on bounding this sum.

379 **When $1 \leq k \leq k_{\max}$:**

380 Consider the ratio of successive terms $\frac{\tilde{s}_p(k+1) \cdot \tilde{P}_p(k+1)}{\tilde{s}_p(k) \cdot \tilde{P}_p(k)}$ of the sequence $(\tilde{s}_p(k) \cdot \tilde{P}_p(k))_{k \geq 1}$.
 381 From Lemmas 16 and 13, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{\tilde{s}_p(k+1) \cdot \tilde{P}_p(k+1)}{\tilde{s}_p(k) \cdot \tilde{P}_p(k)} &= \frac{(6 \cdot 2^{k+1} \delta / \varepsilon)^{d^2} / d!}{(6 \cdot 2^k \delta / \varepsilon)^{d^2} / d!} \times \frac{q^d \cdot \exp(-q(2^k \delta / \varepsilon)^d / 2)}{q^d \cdot \exp(-q(2^{k-1} \delta / \varepsilon)^d / 2)} \\
 &= 2^{d^2} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{q}{2} \cdot ((2^{k-1} \delta / \varepsilon)^d) (2^d - 1)\right) \\
 &= 2^{d^2} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \cdot (2^{(k-1)d} 2d) (2^d - 1)\right) \leq 2^4 e^{-6},
 \end{aligned}$$

385 where in the last step we used the definition of $\delta = \varepsilon(2d/q)^{1/d}$, i.e. $q(\delta/\varepsilon)^d = 2d$. The last
 386 step follows by taking $k = 1, d = 2$, to get $2^4 \cdot e^{-6} \leq (2/e)^6$.

387 **When $k = 0$:**

388 In this case, the ratio $\frac{\tilde{s}_p(1) \cdot \tilde{P}_p(1)}{\tilde{s}_p(0) \cdot \tilde{P}_p(0)} \leq 2^{d^2} \cdot \exp(-d \cdot 2^d)$, which is at most $(2/e)^6$ for $d \geq 2$.
 389 Therefore for all $0 \leq k \leq k_{\max} - 1$, we have that $\frac{\tilde{s}_p(k+1) \cdot \tilde{P}_p(k+1)}{\tilde{s}_p(k) \cdot \tilde{P}_p(k)} \leq (2/e)^6$. Thus, the sum
 390 $\sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}} \mathbb{E}[Z_p(k)]$ is upper bounded by the sum of a geometric progression with leading term
 391 $\tilde{s}_p(0) \cdot \tilde{P}_p(0) \leq 6^{d^2+d}$ and common ratio $(2/e)^6$, which is at most $(1 - (2/e)^6)^{-1} \cdot 6^{d^2+d}$. ◀

392 Lastly, we bound the expected number of simplices with exceptionally large circumradii,
 393 i.e. $\sum_{k > k_{\max}} \mathbb{E}[Z_p(k)]$.

394 **Case II: Simplices with large circumradii $k > k_{\max}$.**

395 In this regime, the circumradii of the potential simplices are greater than $1/4$. Therefore by
 396 Theorem 4, we shall work in the 3^d -sheeted covering of \mathbb{T}^d .

397 ▶ **Lemma 19.** $\sum_{k > k_{\max}} \mathbb{E}[Z_p(k)] \leq 5$.

398 **Proof.** From Lemma 3, we have that $n = \#(\mathcal{X}) \leq 2^{-d} d^{d/2} \varepsilon^{-d}$. Therefore, by Lemma 2, any
 399 ball B of radius at least $2^{k_{\max}} \delta \geq 1/4$, has at least $(2^{k_{\max}} \delta / \varepsilon)^d = (1/4\varepsilon)^d \geq \left(\frac{n}{2^d \cdot d^{d/2}}\right)$ points
 400 in its interior, i.e. $\#(\text{int} B \cap \mathcal{X}) \geq \left(\frac{n}{(2\sqrt{d})^d}\right)$. Here, since $2^{k+1} \delta > 1/2$, we shall use Theorem 4
 401 and work in the 3^d -sheeted covering of \mathbb{T}^d . The maximum number of d -tuples which can
 402 possibly form a Delaunay d -simplex with p , is at most $\binom{n-1}{d} \leq (n-1)^d / d!$. Since we are
 403 working in the 3^d -sheeted covering space, each vertex of a simplex $\tau \in S_p(k)$ can be chosen
 404 from one of at most 3^d copies in the covering space. Thus, each simplex in $S_p(k)$ yields
 405 less than 3^{d^2} possible Delaunay spheres in \mathbb{T}^d . Therefore, the expected number of simplices
 406 having radius at least $2^{k_{\max}} \delta$, is at most

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{k > k_{\max}} \mathbb{E}[Z_p(k)] &= 3^{d^2} \frac{(n-1)^d}{d!} \cdot P_p(k) = 3^{d^2} \frac{(n-1)^d}{d!} \cdot q^d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{q}{2} \cdot \frac{n-1}{(2\sqrt{d})^d}\right) \\
 &\leq 3^{d^2} \frac{(s-1)^d}{d!} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{s-1}{2(2\sqrt{d})^d}\right). \tag{1}
 \end{aligned}$$

409 For $s > s_0 = 4(2\sqrt{d})^d \cdot d^3 + 1$, this function is decreasing in term of s and it is easy to check
 410 that the value in s_0 is smaller than 5. The lemma follows. ◀

411 Thus, by Lemmas 12, 18, and 19, the expected complexity of the star of p is at most
 412 $(1 - (2/e)^6)^{-1} \cdot 6^{d^2+d} + 5 \leq 2 \cdot 6^{d^2+d}$ for $d \geq 2$, which completes the proof of Theorem 9.

413 **5 Polyhedral Surfaces in \mathbb{E}^3**

414 In this section, we introduce a partition of the sub-sample \mathcal{Y} into *boundary* and *interior*
 415 points, to do a case analysis of the expected number of edges in the Delaunay triangulation
 416 $Del(\mathcal{Y})$, depending on whether the end-points of a potential Delaunay edge, are boundary or
 417 interior points, and whether they lie on the same facet or on different facets.

418 **Main ideas:** Our overall strategy will be to mesh the proofs of Attali-Boissonnat [4] and
 419 Theorem 9. Briefly, Attali and Boissonnat reduce the problem to counting the Delaunay edges
 420 of the point sample, which they do by distinguishing between *boundary* and *interior* points
 421 of a facet. For boundary points, they allow all possible edges. For interior points, the case
 422 of edges with endpoints on the same facet is easy to handle, while geometric constructions
 423 are required to handle the case of endpoints on different facets, or that of edges with one
 424 endpoint in the interior and another on the boundary.
 425

426
 427 However, we shall need to introduce some new ideas to adapt our previous methods to
 428 this setting. Firstly, an edge can have multiple balls passing through its endpoints and, as
 429 soon as one of these balls is empty, the edge is in the triangulation. This is handled using
 430 a geometric construction (see Lemma 28). Basically, the idea is to build a constant-sized
 431 packing of a sphere centered on a given point, using large balls, such that any sphere of a
 432 sufficiently large radius which passes through the point, must contain a ball from the packing.
 433

434 Secondly, since we have randomly spaced points at the boundaries, boundary effects
 435 could penetrate deep into the interior. To handle this, we introduce the notion of *levels* of a
 436 surface, instead of the fixed strip around the boundary used in [4], and use a probabilistic,
 437 rather than deterministic, classification of boundary and interior points. The new classifica-
 438 tion is based on the level of a point and the radius of the largest empty disk passing through it.

439 Recall the definitions of \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{S} from Theorem 10. For a curve Γ , $l(\Gamma)$ denotes its
 440 length. For a subset of a surface $R \subset \mathcal{S}$, $a(R)$ denotes the area of R . We next present some
 441 general lemmas, which will be needed in the proofs of the main lemmas. For sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{E}^3$,
 442 $A \oplus B$ denotes the Minkowski sum of A and B , i.e. the set $\{x + y : x \in A, y \in B\}$. For
 443 convenience, the special case $A \oplus B(0, r)$ shall be denoted by $A \oplus r$. Throughout this section,
 444 we shall use κ to denote the maximum number of points of an ε -net in a disk of radius 2ε ,
 445 which is at most $6^d = 36$ (using Lemma 1 with $r = 2\varepsilon$ and $\rho = \varepsilon$), we and define $q := \frac{\kappa}{n}$, and
 446 $\delta := \varepsilon/\sqrt{q}$.

447 **Level sets, Boundary points and Interior points**

448 We now introduce some definitions which will play a central role in the analysis. First we define
 449 the notion of levels. Given facet $F \in \mathcal{S}$ and $k \geq 0$, define the *level set* $L_{\leq k} := F \cap (\partial F \oplus 2^k \delta)$.
 450 $L_{=k} := L_{\leq k} \setminus L_{\leq k-1}$. For $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the *level* of x , denoted $Lev(x)$, is k such that $x \in L_{=k}$.
 451 Let $L_{\leq k}(\mathcal{X}), L_{=k}(\mathcal{X})$ denote $L_{\leq k} \cap \mathcal{X}, L_{=k} \cap \mathcal{X}$ respectively. Note that for $x \in L_{=k}, k \geq 1$,
 452 the distance $d(x, \partial F) \in (2^{k-1}\delta, 2^k\delta]$. Hence, if $Lev(x) = k$, $D(x, 2^{k-1}\delta) \subset F$. For $k = 0$,
 453 $d(x, \partial F) \in [0, \delta]$.
 454

455 Next, we define a bi-partition of the point set into boundary and interior points. Given
 456 $x \in F$ having $Lev(x) = k$, then $x \in Bd_F(\mathcal{Y})$, or x is a *boundary point*, if $k = 0$ or if there
 457 exists an empty disk (w.r.t. \mathcal{Y}) of radius greater than $2^{k-1}\delta$, whose boundary passes through
 458 x . $x \in Int_F(\mathcal{Y})$, or an *interior point* if and only if $x \in \mathcal{Y} \setminus Bd_F(\mathcal{Y})$. In general, $x \in Bd_S(\mathcal{Y})$

459 if $x \in Bd_F(\mathcal{Y})$ for some $F \in \mathcal{S}$, and $x \in Int_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y})$ is defined similarly.

460

461 The above bi-partition induces a classification of potential edges, depending on whether
 462 the end-points are boundary or interior points. Let E_1 denote the set of edges in $Del(\mathcal{Y})$
 463 of the type $\{x_1, x_2\} : x_1, x_2 \in Bd_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y})$. Let E_2 denote the set of edges in $Del(\mathcal{Y})$ of the
 464 type $\{x, y\} : x, y \in Int_F(\mathcal{Y})$, for some $F \in \mathcal{S}$. Let E_3 denote the set of edges in $Del(\mathcal{Y})$ of
 465 the type $\{x, y\} : x, y \in Int_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y})$, such that $x \in F, y \in F' \neq F$. Let E_4 denote the set of
 466 edges $\{x, y\}$ in $Del(\mathcal{Y})$ of the type $x \in Bd_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y}), y \in Int(F)$, where F is a facet in \mathcal{S} with
 467 supporting plane P .

468 We have the following lemmas, to be proved in section 5.2.

469 ► **Lemma 20.** $\mathbb{E} [\#(E_1)] \leq O(1) \cdot (\kappa^2 L^2 / A) \cdot s$.

470 ► **Lemma 21.** $\mathbb{E} [\#(E_2)] \leq c_4 \cdot \kappa s$, where $c_4 \leq 2 \cdot 10^5$.

471 ► **Lemma 22.** $\mathbb{E} [\#(E_3)] \leq c_4 \cdot (C - 1) \cdot \kappa s$.

472 ► **Lemma 23.** $\mathbb{E} [\#(E_4)] \leq O(1) \cdot \frac{\kappa^2 L^2}{A} \cdot s$.

473 Given the above lemmas, the proof of Theorem 10 follows easily.

474 **Proof of Theorem 10.** As in [4] (Section 4), by Euler's formula, the number of tetrahedra
 475 $t(Del(\mathcal{Y}))$ in the Delaunay triangulation of \mathcal{S} , is at most $e(Del(\mathcal{Y})) - \#(\mathcal{Y}) = e(Del(\mathcal{Y})) - s$,
 476 where $e(Del(\mathcal{Y}))$ is the number of edges in the Delaunay triangulation. Therefore, it suffices
 477 to count the edges of $Del(\mathcal{Y})$. Next, observe that any point $x \in \mathcal{Y}$ is either a boundary or an
 478 interior point, that is $Bd_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y}) \sqcup Int_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y}) = \mathcal{Y}$. An edge in $Del(\mathcal{Y})$, therefore, can be either
 479 between two points in $Bd_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y})$, or two points in $Int_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y})$, or between a point in $Bd_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y})$ and
 480 another in $Int_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y})$. The case of a pair of points in $Int_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y})$ is further split based on whether
 481 the points belong to the same facet of \mathcal{S} or different facets. Thus using the above exhaustive
 482 case analysis, the proof follows simply by summing the bounds. ◀

483 Before proving Lemmas 20- 23, we first present a few technical lemmas.

484 5.1 Some Technical Lemmas

485 The following geometric and probabilistic lemmas prove certain properties of ε -nets on
 486 polyhedral surfaces, random subsets, etc., as well as exploit the notion of boundary and
 487 interior points to get an exponential decay for boundary effects penetrating into the interior.

488 ► **Proposition 24** ([4]). *Let F be a facet of \mathcal{S} . For any Borel set $R \subset F$, we have*


489
$$\left(\frac{a(R)}{4\pi\varepsilon^2} \right) \leq \#(R \cap \mathcal{X}) \leq \left(\frac{\kappa \cdot a(R \oplus \varepsilon)}{\pi\varepsilon^2} \right), \text{ and therefore,} \quad (2)$$

490
$$\left(\frac{A}{4\pi\varepsilon^2} \right) \leq \#(\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{X}) = n. \quad (3)$$

491 ► **Proposition 25** ([4]). *Let F be a facet of \mathcal{S} , let $\Gamma \subset F$ be a curve contained in F , and
 492 $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

493
$$\#((\Gamma \oplus k\varepsilon) \cap \mathcal{X}) \leq \left(\frac{(2k+1)^2}{k} \right) \kappa \frac{l(\Gamma)}{\varepsilon} \quad (4)$$

494
$$\leq \left(9k\kappa \frac{l(\Gamma)}{\varepsilon} \right), \text{ when } k \geq 1. \quad (5)$$



497 ■ **Figure 1** Angle covered by disk of radius 1/2 is $= 2\alpha$.

495 ► **Lemma 26.** *Given a circle $\Sigma_1 \subset \mathbb{E}^2$ of unit radius centered at the origin, seven disks*
 496 *having centers in Σ_1 and radius 1/2, are necessary and sufficient to cover Σ_1 .*

498 **Proof.** Let D_2 denote a disk of radius 1/2, having its center lying on the circle Σ_1 . Let 2α
 499 denote the angle subtended by $\Sigma_1 \cap D_2$ on the center of Σ_1 . By symmetry, the angle $\angle OAB$
 500 in figure 1 is α . Applying the sine law to the triangle OAB , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 501 \quad \frac{1}{\sin \beta} &= \frac{1/2}{\sin \alpha}, \\
 502 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{1}{\sin(\pi/2 - \alpha/2)} &= \frac{1/2}{\sin \alpha}, \\
 503 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{1}{\cos(\alpha/2)} &= \frac{1/2}{\sin \alpha}, \\
 504 \quad \Rightarrow \quad 4 \sin(\alpha/2) &= 1.
 \end{aligned}$$

505 Therefore, $\alpha = 2 \arcsin(1/4)$, or $2\alpha = 4 \arcsin(1/4)$.
 506 Thus, one disk covers an angle of $4 \arcsin(1/4)$, and so the number of required disks having
 507 radius 1/2, is at least $\frac{2\pi}{4 \arcsin(1/4)} \approx 6.21 < 7$.

508
 509 It is now easy to see that we can place the disks on the boundary in a greedy manner,
 510 such that they cover the maximum possible angle, except of course the last disk which may
 511 have some overlap with the first disk. Thus seven disks would suffice as well. ◀

512 ► **Lemma 27 (Level Size).** $\#(L_{=k} \cap \mathcal{X}) \leq \#(L_{\leq k} \cap \mathcal{X}) \leq 9\kappa L \left(\frac{2^k \delta}{\varepsilon^2}\right)$.


513 **Proof.** The first inequality is obvious, as $L_{=k} \subseteq L_{\leq k}$. The proof of the second inequality
 514 follows by applying Proposition 25 over the boundaries of the facets. For a fixed facet $F \in \mathcal{S}$,
 515 we get

$$516 \quad \# \left(\left(\partial F \oplus \left(\frac{2^k \delta}{\varepsilon} \right) \varepsilon \right) \cap \mathcal{X} \right) \leq \left(\frac{9\kappa 2^k \delta}{\varepsilon} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{l(\partial F)}{\varepsilon} \right).$$

517 Summing over all $F \in \mathcal{S}$, we get

$$518 \quad \#(L_{\leq k} \cap \mathcal{X}) = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{S}} \# \left((\partial F \oplus 2^k \delta) \cap \mathcal{X} \right) \leq \left(\frac{9\kappa 2^k \delta}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \sum_{F \in \mathcal{S}} l(\partial F) = \left(\frac{9\kappa 2^k \delta}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \cdot L.$$

519 ◀



520 ■ **Figure 2** For Lemma 28

521 ► **Lemma 28.** *Let F be a facet of \mathcal{S} with supporting plane P , and $x \in F$ with $\text{Lev}(x) > 0$.
522 Then there exists a collection \mathcal{D}_x of at most $c_B = 7$ disks in F , such that*

- 523 (i) *Each $D \in \mathcal{D}_x$ is contained in F ,*
524 (ii) *Each $D \in \mathcal{D}_x$ has radius $r_0/4$, where $r_0 = 2^k \delta$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 \leq k < \text{Lev}(x)$, and*
525 (iii) *Any disk $D \subset P$ of radius at least r_0 , such that $x \in \partial D$, contains at least one disk in \mathcal{D}_x .*

526 **Proof.** Let $D_0 = D(y, r)$ for some $y \in P$, $r \geq r_0$, be a disk such that $x \in \partial D_0$. Let
527 $D_1 = D(x', r_0)$ be the unique disk with centre x' on the line xy , radius r_0 , and having
528 $x \in \partial D_1$. Note that

- 529 (a) $D_1 \subseteq D_0$ by construction, and,
530 (b) $x' \in F$, since $r_0 = 2^k \delta \leq 2^{\text{Lev}(x)-1} \delta$, so that $x' \in D(x, r_0) \subset F$.

531 Consider $\Sigma_2 = \Sigma(x, r_0/2)$, and let $p = xx' \cap \Sigma_2$, that is, the point p lies on the line
532 xx' , at distance $r_0/2$ from x (and therefore from x' as well). We shall build a minimal
533 covering \mathcal{D} of the circle Σ_2 , by disks centered in Σ_2 , having radius $r_0/4$. From Lemma 26,
534 we get $\sharp(\mathcal{D}) = 7$. Let $D' \in \mathcal{D}$ be a disk in the covering. Then by the triangle inequality,
535 $D' \subset D(x, r_0/2 + r_0/4) \subset D(x, r_0)$. As before, by the definitions of $\text{Lev}(x)$ and r_0 , this
536 implies $D' \subset F$. Thus \mathcal{D} satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) of the lemma. Further, since \mathcal{D} is a
537 covering of Σ_2 , there exists $D_p \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $p \in D_p$. Therefore, the disk $D_p \subset D_1 \subset D_0$,
538 and $D_p \subset F$. Thus $D_p \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfies condition (iii). Now taking $\mathcal{D}_x = \mathcal{D}$ completes the proof
539 of the lemma. ◀

540 ► **Lemma 29** (Decay lemma). *Given $x_1, \dots, x_t \in \mathcal{X}$, such that $\text{Lev}(x_i) > 0$, $1 \leq i \leq t$, then
541 for all $0 \leq k_i < \text{Lev}(x_i)$, with $r_i^* := 2^{k_i} \delta$, the probability of the event*

542
$$E := \{\forall i \in [t] : \exists D_i = D(y_i, r_i) : r_i \geq r_i^*, x_i \in \mathcal{Y}, x_i \in \partial D_i \text{ and } \text{int}(D_i) \cap \mathcal{Y} = \emptyset\},$$

543 is given by

544
$$\mathbb{P}[E] \leq \begin{cases} q^t, & \text{if } k_{\max} = 0, \\ c_1 \cdot q^t \cdot \exp(-c_2 \cdot 2^{2k_{\max}}), & \text{if } k_{\max} > 0, \end{cases}$$

23:16 RIC of Delaunay triangulations of nice point sets

545 where $c_1 = c_B^t$, $c_2 \geq 2^{-7}$, and $k_{\max} := \max_i \{k_i\}$. Thus

$$546 \quad \mathbb{P}[E] \leq c_1 \cdot q^t \cdot \exp(-c_2 \cdot 2^{2k_{\max}}), \quad k_{\max} \geq 0.$$

547 **Proof.** Firstly, consider the case where $k_{\max} = 0$, i.e. all the k_i 's are zero. In this case we
548 simply upper bound the probability of the event E , by the probability of including all the
549 points x_1, \dots, x_t in \mathcal{Y} . By Lemma 8, this is at most q^t .

550 We next come to the case when $k_{\max} > 0$. Since for all $i \in [t]$, $k_i < Lev(x_i)$, we can apply
551 Lemma 28 for each i , with $k = k_i$, to conclude that for each i , there exists a collection \mathcal{D}_i
552 of at most c_B disks of radius $r_i^*/4$, such that any disk having radius greater than r_i^* and
553 passing through x_i , must contain some disk $D_i^* \in \mathcal{D}_i$. Let T denote the set $\prod_{i=1}^t \mathcal{D}_i$. By the
554 union bound over the set T , we get

$$555 \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[E] &\leq \mathbb{P}[\exists B \in T : \forall i \in [t], B_i \cap \mathcal{Y} = \emptyset] \\ 556 &\leq \#(T) \cdot \mathbb{P}[\forall i \in [t], B_i \cap \mathcal{Y} = \emptyset], \end{aligned}$$

557 where $B \in T$ is some fixed element of T .

558 Let $j := \arg \max_{i \in [t]} k_i$, so that $k_{\max} = k_j$. Now, the event E requires the set x_1, \dots, x_t
559 to be in the sample \mathcal{Y} , and the interiors of the disks D_i^* to be free from points in \mathcal{Y} . In
560 particular, the disk D_j^* should not contain any points in \mathcal{Y} . Therefore applying Lemma 8 on
561 the universe $C = \mathcal{X}$, the random sample $A = \mathcal{Y}$, the included subset $B = \{x_1, \dots, x_t\}$, and
562 the excluded subset $Z = D_j^* \cap \mathcal{X}$ of size at least $z = \frac{\pi(r_j^*/4)^2}{4\pi\varepsilon^2}$, we get

$$563 \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[E] &\leq \#(T) \cdot \mathbb{P}[\forall B_i \in u, B_i \cap \mathcal{Y} = \emptyset] \\ 564 &\leq (c_B)^t \cdot q^t \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}q \cdot \left(\frac{\pi(r_j^*/4)^2}{4\pi\varepsilon^2}\right)\right) \\ 565 &\leq c_1 q^t \cdot \exp(-2^{2k_{\max}-7}). \end{aligned}$$

566 where in the last step we used that $q = s/n$, $\delta = \sqrt{n/s} \cdot \varepsilon$, and $r_j^* = 2^{k_{\max}}\delta$, and set
567 $c_1 = c_B^t$. \blacktriangleleft

568 **► Lemma 30 (Growth Lemma).** Given any point $x \in \mathcal{S}$ in a facet F , and $0 \leq k < Lev(x)$,
569 we have

$$570 \quad (i) \quad 2^{2k-2}/q \leq \#(D(x, 2^k\delta) \cap \mathcal{X}) \leq 4 \cdot (2^{2k}/q).$$

$$571 \quad (ii) \quad 2^{2k-2} \leq \#(D(x, 2^k\delta) \cap \mathcal{Y}) \leq 4 \cdot (2^{2k}).$$

572 **Proof.** By the definition of $Lev(x)$, we have that $D(x, 2^{Lev(x)-1}\delta) \subset F$. Now the statement
573 follows by the application of Proposition 24, as below

$$574 \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\pi(2^k\delta)^2}{4\pi\varepsilon^2} &\leq \#(D(x, 2^k\delta) \cap \mathcal{X}) \leq \frac{\pi(2^k\delta + \varepsilon)^2}{\pi\varepsilon^2}, \text{ or,} \\ 575 \quad \frac{2^{2k-2}n}{s} &\leq \#(D(x, 2^k\delta) \cap \mathcal{X}) \leq \frac{2 \cdot 2^{2k}n}{s}, \end{aligned}$$

576 where we used that $\delta := (\sqrt{\frac{n}{s}})\varepsilon$. This gives the first statement of the lemma, using $q = s/n$.
577 The second statement follows simply by taking expectation. \blacktriangleleft

578 **5.2 Proofs of Lemmas 20-23**

579 The proofs of Lemmas 20 and 21 now follow from the Decay and Growth lemmas, together
580 with similar ideas as for the flat torus case.

581 **Proof of Lemma 20.** Let $x_1, x_2 \in Bd_S(\mathcal{Y})$. To bound the expected number of edges in E_1 ,
582 we simply bound the number of pairs $(x_1, x_2) \in Bd_S(\mathcal{Y}) \times Bd_S(\mathcal{Y})$. Let $l_1 := Lev(x)$ and
583 $l_2 := Lev(y)$, and let $l := \max_i(l_i)_{i=1}^2$. By definition, if $l = 0$, then $x_1, x_2 \in Bd_S(\mathcal{Y})$. For
584 $l \geq 1$, we get that $x_1 \in Bd_S(\mathcal{Y})$ and $x_2 \in Bd_S(\mathcal{Y})$ only if there exists a disk of radius at
585 least $2^{l-1}\delta$ passing through x_1 or x_2 , and containing no points of \mathcal{Y} . Therefore to bound the
586 probability that $(x_1, x_2) \in (Bd_S(\mathcal{Y}))^2$, we can apply the Decay Lemma 29, with $t = 2$, for
587 $i \in \{1, 2\}$. We get

$$588 \quad \mathbb{P}[(x_1, x_2) \in E_1] \leq \mathbb{P}[(x_1, x_2) \in (Bd_S(\mathcal{Y}))^2]$$

$$589 \quad \leq c_1 q^2 \cdot \exp(-c_2 \cdot 2^{2l-2}) \leq c_1 q^2 \cdot \exp(-c'_2 \cdot 2^{2l}), \quad (6)$$

590 where $c'_2 = c_2/4 = 2^{-9}$. Summing over all choices of levels of x_1 and x_2 , we have

$$591 \quad \mathbb{E}[\#(E_1)] \leq \sum_{l_1 \geq 0} \#(L_{=l_1} \cap \mathcal{X}) \sum_{l_2 \geq 0} \#(L_{=l_2} \cap \mathcal{X}) \mathbb{P}[(x_1, x_2) \in (Bd_S(\mathcal{Y}))^2].$$

592 By symmetry, it is enough to assume without loss of generality that $l_1 \geq l_2$, i.e. $l = l_1$. Thus,

$$593 \quad \mathbb{E}[\#(E_1)] \leq 2 \sum_{l_1 \geq 0} \#(L_{=l_1} \cap \mathcal{X}) \sum_{l_2=0}^{l_1} \#(L_{=l_2} \cap \mathcal{X}) \mathbb{P}[(x_1, x_2) \in (Bd_S(\mathcal{Y}))^2].$$

594 Applying equation (6) and the Level Size Lemma 27, we get

$$595 \quad \mathbb{E}[\#(E_1)] \leq 2 \sum_{l_1 \geq 0} \#(L_{\leq l_1} \cap \mathcal{X}) \sum_{l_2=0}^{l_1} \#(L_{\leq l_2} \cap \mathcal{X}) \cdot c_1 q^2 \cdot \exp(-c'_2 \cdot 2^{2l_1})$$

$$596 \quad \leq 2c_1 q^2 \sum_{l_1 \geq 0} (9\kappa L \cdot (2^{l_1} \delta / \varepsilon^2)) \sum_{l_2=0}^{l_1} (9\kappa L \cdot (2^{l_2} \delta / \varepsilon^2)) \cdot \exp(-c'_2 \cdot 2^{2l_1})$$

$$597 \quad \leq 2c_1 q^2 (9\kappa L \left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon^2}\right))^2 \sum_{l_1 \geq 0} 2^{l_1} \cdot \exp(-c'_2 \cdot 2^{2l_1}) \sum_{l_2=0}^{l_1} 2^{l_2}.$$

598 Using the definitions of q and δ , together with Proposition 24, and writing the terms
599 outside the summation as N_1 , we get $N_1 := 2 \cdot c_1 q^2 (9\kappa L \left(\frac{\delta}{\varepsilon^2}\right))^2 = 2c_1 \cdot (9\kappa L)^2 \left(\frac{s}{n\varepsilon^2}\right) \leq$
600 $4c_1 \cdot \left(\frac{4\pi(9\kappa L)^2}{A}\right) \cdot s$, we continue

$$601 \quad \mathbb{E}[\#(E_1)] \leq N_1 \sum_{l_1 \geq 0} 2^{l_1} \cdot \exp(-c'_2 \cdot 2^{2l_1}) \cdot 2 \cdot 2^{l_1} \leq 2N_1 \sum_{l_1 \geq 0} 2^{2l_1} \cdot \exp(-c'_2 \cdot 2^{2l_1}).$$

602 The summation can be bounded using Lemma 46, to get

$$603 \quad \mathbb{E}[\#(E_1)] \leq 2N_1 \cdot \left(2 \cdot \frac{\log 1/c'_2}{2ec'_2}\right) = 2N_1 \cdot \frac{\log 1/c'_2}{e \cdot c'_2}.$$

604 Now substituting $c'_2 = 2^{-9}$ gives $\mathbb{E}[\#(E_1)] \leq 2 \cdot 10^4 \cdot c_1 \cdot \left(\frac{4\pi(9\kappa L)^2}{A}\right) \cdot s$. ◀

23:18 RIC of Delaunay triangulations of nice point sets

605 **Proof of Lemma 21.** Let l denote $\min\{Lev(x), Lev(y)\}$. Observe that if $l = 0$, then either x
 606 or y is a boundary point, and hence we can assume $l \geq 1$. Let $x' = \arg \min_{z \in \partial F} d(z, x)$, and
 607 $y' = \arg \min_{z \in \partial F} d(z, y)$, i.e. x' is the closest point to x in ∂F , and similarly for y' . By the
 608 definition of $Bd_S(\mathcal{Y})$, observe that $d(x, y) \leq d(x, x') + d(x', y) \leq d(x, x') + d(y, y') \leq 2 \cdot 2^{l-1} \delta$.
 609 Hence we have that $d(x, y) \leq 2^l \delta$.

610 By the Growth Lemma 30, the expected number of Delaunay neighbours y of a point x
 611 such that $d(x, y) \leq \delta$ is at most $\mathbb{E}[D(x, \delta) \cap \mathcal{Y}] \leq q \cdot \frac{4}{q} = 4$. Thus the expected number of
 612 edges in E_2 from pairs (x, y) with $x, y \in Int_F(\mathcal{Y})$ for some $F \in \mathcal{S}$, and $d(x, y) \leq \delta$, is at most
 613 $4 \cdot \#\mathcal{Y}$. For longer-distance edges, let $k \geq 1$ be such that $2^{k-1} \delta \leq d(x, y) \leq 2^k \delta$. Taking
 614 $t = 2$, $x_1 = x$, $x_2 = y$, $k_1 = k - 1$, and $k_2 \leq k_1$, and applying the Decay Lemma 29, we get
 615 that

$$616 \quad \mathbb{P}[\{x, y\} \in E_2] \leq c_1 q^2 \cdot \exp(-c_2 2^{2k-2}) \leq c_1 q^2 \cdot \exp(-c'_2 2^{2k}),$$

617 where $c'_2 = c_2/4$. Summing over all possible choices of $l \geq 1$, and $k \leq l$, we get

$$618 \quad \mathbb{E}[\#(E_2)] \leq \sum_{l \geq 1} \#(L_{=l} \cap \mathcal{X}) \sum_{k=1}^l \#(D(x, 2^k \delta) \cap \mathcal{X}) \cdot c_1 q^2 \cdot \exp(-c'_2 2^{2k})$$

$$619 \quad \leq c_1 q^2 \left(\sum_{l \geq 1} \#(L_{=l} \cap \mathcal{X}) \sum_{k=1}^l \kappa 2^{2k} (\delta/\varepsilon)^2 \cdot \exp(-c'_2 2^{2k}) \right)$$

$$620 \quad \leq c_1 \kappa q \left(\frac{q \delta^2}{\varepsilon^2} \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{l \geq 1} \#(L_{=l} \cap \mathcal{X}) \right) \frac{2 \cdot (1/2) \cdot \log 1/c'_2}{ec'_2}$$


$$621 \quad \leq c_1 \kappa q \cdot c_3 \left(\sum_{l \geq 1} \#(L_{=l} \cap \mathcal{X}) \right)$$

$$622 \quad \leq c_1 \kappa q \cdot c_3 \cdot n = c_4 \cdot \kappa s.$$

623 where in the second step we applied the Growth Lemma 30, and in the third step we bounded
 624 the sum $\sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{2k} \exp(-c_2 2^{2k})$ using Lemma 46, and used that $q = s/n = \varepsilon^2/\delta^2$. Note that
 625 $c_3 \leq 4 \cdot 10^3$, and $c_4 := c_1 \cdot c_3 \leq 2 \cdot 10^5$. \blacktriangleleft

626 For the proofs of Lemmas 22 and 23, we need some more geometric ideas of [4].

627 **Proof of Lemma 22.** Let $x, y \in Int_S(\mathcal{Y})$, where $x \in F$ and $y \in F'$, for some $F, F' \in \mathcal{S}$. Let
 628 F' be fixed. To analyse this case, we shall first give a geometric construction of [4], and state
 629 an observation from their proof.



630 ■ **Figure 3** $x, y \in Int_S(\mathcal{Y})$, on different facets $F \subset P, F' \subset P'$

631 ▶ **Construction 31** (Attali-Boissonnat [4]). *Let P and P' denote the supporting planes of*
 632 *the facets F and F' respectively. Let P_B be the bisector plane of P and P' . We denote by*
 633 *$x' \in P'$, the reflection of $x \in P$ with respect to P_B , and similarly by $y' \in P$, the reflection*
 634 *of $y \in P'$. Let $B = B_{xyx'y'}$ be the smallest ball in \mathbb{E}^3 passing through x, y, x', y' , having*
 635 *intersections $D_1 = B \cap P$ and $D_2 = B \cap P'$ with P and P' respectively.*

636 Attali and Boissonnat observed that

637 ▶ **Proposition 32** (Attali-Boissonnat [4]). *Any ball in \mathbb{E}^3 having x and y on its boundary,*
 638 *must contain either D_1 or D_2 .*

639 Therefore, if there exists a ball $B \in \mathbb{E}^3$ such that $x, y \in \partial B$, and $\text{int}(B) \cap \mathcal{Y} = \emptyset$, then
 640 either $D_1 \cap \mathcal{Y} = \emptyset$, or $D_2 \cap \mathcal{Y} = \emptyset$. We get

641
$$\mathbb{P}[\{x, y\} \in E_3] \leq \mathbb{P}[\cup_{i=1}^2 \{D_i \cap \mathcal{Y} = \emptyset\}] \leq 2 \cdot \mathbb{P}[D_1 \cap \mathcal{Y} = \emptyset].$$

642 Observe that, as in Case II, we have $x' \in D(y, 2^{Lev(y)}\delta)$, since otherwise $y \in Bd_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y})$. (Note
 643 that our definition of boundary points allows us to ignore the fact that x' is not necessarily
 644 a point in \mathcal{X} .) Further, the set $\{x' \in D(y, 2^k\delta)\}$, $0 < k < Lev(y)$, is bounded in size by
 645 $\#(D(y', 2^k\delta) \cap F \cap \mathcal{Y})$. The rest of the analysis for the fixed facet F' , therefore follows as in
 646 Case II. Summing over all $F' \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \{F\}$, we get $\mathbb{E}[\#(E_3)] \leq c_4 \cdot (C - 1)\kappa s$. ◀

647 Before proving Lemma 23, we briefly describe a construction, which will be central to our
 648 analysis.

649 ▶ **Construction 33** (Attali-Boissonnat [4]). *Let P be a plane and Z be a finite set of points.*
 650 *To each point $x \in Z$, assign the region $V(x) = V_x(Z) \subset P$ of points $y \in P$ such that the sphere*
 651 *tangent to P at y and passing through x encloses no point of Z . Let $\mathcal{V} := \{V(x) : x \in Z\}$.*

652 We summarize some conclusions of Attali-Boissonnat regarding the construction. The
 653 proofs of these propositions can be found in [4].

654 ▶ **Proposition 34.** (i) \mathcal{V} is a partition of P .

655 (ii) For each $x \in Z$, $V(x)$ is an intersection of regions that are either disks or complements
 656 of disks.

657 (iii) The total length of the boundary curves in \mathcal{V} is equal to the total length of the convex
 658 boundaries.

659 **Proof.** The proofs are (i) and (ii) are easy.

660 (iii) Consider a point $x \in Z$, and let $V(x)$ be the region corresponding to x in \mathcal{V} . By
 661 Proposition 34 (ii), $V(x) = (\cap_{D \in D_x} D) \cap (\cap_{\bar{D} \in C_x} \bar{D})$, where D_x is a set of disks and C_x is
 662 a set of complements of disks in the plane P . Let $y \in \partial V(x)$. Then if $y \in \cap_{D \in D_x} D$, then
 663 there exists $D_1 \in D_x$, such that $y \in \partial D_1$, and so y is part of a convex segment in $\partial V(x)$.
 664 Otherwise, there exists $\bar{D}_2 \in C_x$, such that $y \in \partial \bar{D}_2$. In this case, let $V(z)$, $z \in Z$, denote
 665 the region such that $y \in \partial V(z)$. Then $D_2 \supset V(z)$, and therefore y belongs to a convex
 666 segment in $\partial V(z)$.

667 Thus, every point $y \in \partial V(x)$ is convex either for $V(x)$ or for a neighbouring region of
 668 $V(x)$, and so the total length of the convex boundary curves in \mathcal{V} gives the total length
 669 of all the boundary curves.
 670 ◀

671 For the rest of this subsection, we shall apply Construction 33 on the plane P , and the
 672 points in $Bd_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y})$ as Z . Let $\mathcal{T} := \text{Int}_F(\mathcal{Y})$ for some facet $F \in \mathcal{S}$. Given $x \in Z$, $y \in P \setminus V(x)$,
 673 let $k_y = k_y(x)$ denote the least $k \geq 0$ such that $y \in \partial V(x) \oplus 2^k\delta$.

704 $Y \in \binom{\mathcal{X}}{s}$. Conditioning on this choice of \mathcal{Y} , $Bd_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y})$ is a fixed set of points. The number of
 705 pairs contributing to $E_4(Int(F))$ is at most $\sharp(\{(x, y) \in Y \times Y \mid x \in Bd_{\mathcal{S}}(Y), y \in V_F(x)\})$.
 706 The main observation is now that since \mathcal{V} restricted to F is a sub-division of F , for each
 707 $y \in \mathcal{X} \cap F$, there is a unique $x = x_y \in Bd_{\mathcal{S}}(Y)$ such that $y \in V_F(x)$. Therefore we get

$$708 \quad E_4(Int(F)) \leq \sum_{V_F(x) \in \mathcal{V}: x \in Bd_{\mathcal{S}}(Y)} \sharp(V_F(x) \cap Y) \leq \sharp(Y \cap F).$$

709 Since the last bound holds for any choice of Y , taking expectation over all choices we get

$$710 \quad \mathbb{E}[E_4(Int(F))] \leq \mathbb{E}[\sharp(\mathcal{Y} \cap F)] = q \cdot \sharp(\mathcal{X} \cap F).$$

711 Now summing over all faces gives $[E_4(Int)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\sharp(\mathcal{Y})] = s$.

712 ◀

713 **► Lemma 38.** *Given a facet $F \in \mathcal{S}$, $\mathbb{E}[E_4(Bd(F))] \leq \left(O(1) \cdot \frac{\kappa^2 L \cdot l(\partial F) s}{A}\right)$. As a consequence,*
 714 $\mathbb{E}[E_4(Bd(\mathcal{S}))] \leq \left(O(1) \cdot \frac{\kappa^2 L^2 s}{A}\right)$.

715 **Proof.** To compute the expected value of $E_4(Bd(\mathcal{S}))$, fix a face $F \in \mathcal{S}$. Consider a pair of
 716 points $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, such that $y \in F$. Let $\mathcal{E}_{x,y}$ denote the event $\{x, y\} \in E_4(Bd(F))$.

717 The value of $E_4(Bd)$ is the number of $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, such that $\mathcal{E}_{x,y}$ occurs. Taking expectations,

$$718 \quad \mathbb{E}[E_4(Bd(F))] \leq \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X} \cap F} \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{x,y}]. \quad (7)$$

719 Observe that $\mathcal{E}_{x,y}$ occurs only if (i) $x \in Bd_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y})$ and (ii) $k_y(x) \leq Lev(y)$, by applying
 720 Construction 33, on the plane P , $Z = Bd_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y})$, and $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{Y} \cap P$, and using Proposition 35.
 721 By Lemma 36, $k_y(x) \in [0, Lev(y)]$.

722 Let P_{k_1, k_2} denote the probability that $\{x, y\} \in E_4(Bd(F))$, with $Lev(x) = k_1$, and
 723 $k_y(x) = k_2$. Equation (7) can be rewritten in terms of k_1 and k_2 as

$$724 \quad \mathbb{E}[E_4(Bd(F))] \leq \sum_{k_1 \geq 0} \sharp(L_{=k_1} \cap \mathcal{X}) \sum_{k_2 \geq 0} \sum_{V_F \in \mathcal{V}} \sharp((\partial V_F \oplus 2^{k_2} \delta) \cap \mathcal{X}) \cdot P_{k_1, k_2}.$$

725 Applying the Decay Lemma 29 with $t = 2$, $x_1 = x$, $x_2 = y$, $k_1 = \max\{0, k_1 - 1\}$ (since
 726 $x \in Bd_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y})$), and $k_2 = \max\{0, k_2 - 1\}$, we get

$$727 \quad P_{k_1, k_2} \leq c_1 q^2 \cdot \exp(-f(k^*)),$$

728 where $k^* := \max\{0, k_1 - 1, k_2 - 1\}$, and $f(k^*) = 0$ if $k^* = 0$, and $c'_2 \cdot 2^{2k^*}$ otherwise, with
 729 $c'_2 = c_2/4$.

730 As in the proof of Lemma 20, we shall use symmetry to handle the case where $k_1 \geq k_2$
 731 and $k_2 > k_1$ together. We get

$$732 \quad \mathbb{E}[E_4(Bd(F))] \leq 2 \sum_{k_1 \geq 0} \sharp(L_{=k_1} \cap \mathcal{X}) \sum_{k_2 \leq k_1} \sum_{V(x) \in \mathcal{V}} \sharp((\partial V(x) \oplus 2^{k_2} \delta) \cap \mathcal{X}) \cdot c_1 q^2 \cdot \exp(-c'_2 2^{2k_1}).$$

733 By the Level Size Lemma 27, we get that $\sharp(L_{=k_1} \cap \mathcal{X}) \leq \frac{9\kappa L 2^{k_1} \delta}{\varepsilon^2}$. Using Proposition 25, we
 734 get that $\sharp(\{\partial V(x) \oplus 2^{k_2} \delta\} \cap \mathcal{Y}) \leq \frac{9\kappa \cdot l(\partial V(x)) 2^{k_2} \delta}{\varepsilon^2}$. By Proposition 34 (iii), each boundary in
 735 the partition \mathcal{V} is convex for some $x \in Bd_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y})$. Therefore we need to sum $l(\partial V(x))$ only
 736 over the convex curves in $\partial V(x)$, $x \in Bd_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{Y})$. The length of these curves is at most $l(\partial F)$.
 737 Thus we get

$$738 \quad \mathbb{E}[E_4(Bd(F))] \leq 2L \cdot l(\partial F) \cdot \left(\frac{9\kappa \delta q}{\varepsilon^2}\right)^2 \sum_{k_1 \geq 0} 2^{k_1} \sum_{k_2 \leq k_1} 2^{k_2} c_1 \cdot \exp(-c'_2 \cdot 2^{2k_1}).$$

739 Using Lemma 46, the above summation is bounded by a constant. This comes to $c_1 \cdot$
 740 $O(1) \left(\frac{(9\kappa)^2 L \cdot l(\partial F) \delta^2 q^2}{\varepsilon^4} \right) = O\left(\frac{\kappa^2 L \cdot l(\partial F) s}{A} \right)$, where the last step followed from the lower bound
 741 on n in Proposition 24 (3), and the identities $q = s/n = \delta^2/\varepsilon^2$. Summing y over all facets F
 742 in \mathcal{S} , we get $\mathbb{E}[E_4(Bd(\mathcal{S}))] = \left(O(1) \cdot \frac{\kappa^2 L^2 s}{A} \right)$. ◀

743 **6 Randomized Incremental Construction (Proof of Theorem 11)**

744 In this section, we show how theorems 9 and 10 imply bounds on the computational complexity
 745 of constructing Delaunay triangulations of ε -nets. Our main tool shall be Theorem 7. However,
 746 we need to show first that Condition 6 holds. The standard proof of this (see e.g. [12], [10],
 747 also the discussion in [9](Section 2.2 D)) is sketched below.

748 Now we come to the proof of Theorem 11.

749 **Proof.** To verify that Condition 6 indeed holds in the Euclidean metric case, observe first
 750 that the union \mathcal{C}_p of the simplices in conflict with a new point p is a connected set. Therefore,
 751 walking on the adjacency graph of the simplices by rotating around the $(d-2)$ -simplex shared
 752 between two adjacent faces on the boundary of \mathcal{C}_p , is enough to yield the set of new conflicts.
 753 This idea works directly when the Delaunay complex is embedded in the one-sheeted covering
 754 of \mathbb{T}^d . In the 3^d -sheeted covering, there can be at most 3^{d^2} simplices formed using a given
 755 set of d points and p , and we need to check each of these possible simplices. Thus the time
 756 goes up by a multiplicative factor of 3^{d^2} . However, as the increase is by a constant factor
 757 depending only on the dimension, Condition 6 is still satisfied, albeit with a larger constant.
 758 Now Theorem 7 can be applied to get the claimed result. ◀

759 **7 Euclidean Orbifolds and Bounded-Distortion Metrics**

760 In this section, we shall give some extensions of Theorem 9 and 11. The proofs of our
 761 theorems follow by finding covering spaces of bounded multiplicity where the Delaunay
 762 complex can be embedded, and generalizing Lemmas 16–19 to such spaces.

763 Given a space \mathcal{S} , $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, an (ε, κ) -sample is a set of points for which any
 764 ball of radius ε in \mathcal{S} , contains at least one point and at most κ points.

765 ▶ **Theorem 39.** *Theorems 9, 10 and 11 hold when the point set is an (ε, κ) sample.*

766 ▶ **Theorem 40.** *Theorems 9, 10 and 11 also work for the case when the random sample is
 767 an i.i.d. sample with probability parameter $q = s/n$.*

768 **Proof Sketch.** The proof is on the lines of Theorems 9 and 10. It is only when computing
 769 $P_p(k)$ that we make use of the fact that points are selected independently. Here, we get
 770 directly that $P_p(k) \leq q^d(1-q)^{n_k} \leq q^d \cdot \exp(-qn_k)$. The rest of the proof follows as before. ◀

771 Coming to our results for Delaunay triangulations of Euclidean d -manifolds and embedded
 772 metrics in \mathbb{T}^d , we need a few definitions first.

773 **Euclidean d -orbifolds**

774 A d -dimensional Bieberbach group \mathcal{G} is a discrete group of isometries acting on \mathbb{E}^d . A
 775 d -orbifold \mathbb{E}^d/\mathcal{G} is the compact quotient space (i.e. collection of orbits) of \mathbb{E}^d acted on by a
 776 d -dimensional Bieberbach group \mathcal{G} . When the group action is free (i.e. has no fixed points),
 777 the d -orbifold is a closed Euclidean d -manifold. Every Euclidean d -manifold is the quotient
 778 space of some d -Bieberbach group acting on \mathbb{E}^d [7], [31]. For Euclidean d -orbifolds, we have:

779 ► **Theorem 41.** *Given a closed Euclidean d -orbifold $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{E}^d/\mathcal{G}$, equipped with the Euclidean*
 780 *metric, where \mathcal{G} is a d -Bieberbach group, there exists a covering space $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{M}}$ with multiplicity*
 781 *$m = m^*(\mathcal{G}, d)$, such that the Delaunay complex on \mathbb{M} is a triangulation of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{M}}$, and the*
 782 *statements of Theorems 9 and 11 apply for ε -nets, for any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1/4]$.*

783 **Proof.** In this case, the existence of the covering space follows from the algorithmic version
 784 of Bieberbach's theorem [6] by Caroli-Teillaud [11](Section 4).

785 ► **Theorem 42** (Bieberbach [6], Caroli-Teillaud [11]). *Every Euclidean d -orbifold \mathbb{M} has a*
 786 *covering space using a number $m_{\mathbb{M}}$ of sheets of a d -hyperparallelepiped $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\mathbb{M}}^d$, where $m_{\mathbb{M}}$ depends*
 787 *only on d , such that the Delaunay triangulation of any point set on \mathbb{M} is the projection of*
 788 *the Delaunay complex of the cover of the point set in the covering space.*

789 The proof of Theorem 41 is on similar lines as that of Theorem 9, except (i) we work with
 790 the hyperparallelepiped $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\mathbb{M}}^d$, and (ii) we need to take the effect of the multiplicity (i.e. the
 791 number $m_{\mathbb{M}}$ of sheets of $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\mathbb{M}}^d$ required for Theorem 42 to hold) into account for all simplices.
 792 To handle (i), we observe that the volume of balls will change as the hyperparallelepiped is
 793 no longer a hypercube. Thus, a factor of the volume of the unit hyperparallelepiped $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}_{\mathbb{M}}^d$, will
 794 come into the estimates in Lemma 5. To handle the effect of multiplicity, we introduce an
 795 extra multiplicative factor of $m_{\mathbb{M}}^d$ in the bound of the number of possible d -simplices with
 796 any fixed set of points (compared to Lemma 19). Additionally, we take into account that
 797 the number of *distinct* points inside a potential simplex is at least a $1/m_{\mathbb{M}}$ -fraction of the
 798 number guaranteed by Lemma 13. This gives a worse bound for the expected complexity of
 799 the star than in Theorem 9, but still a constant. ◀

800 Embedded metrics with bounded distortion

801 For a metric \mathfrak{d} on some domain \mathcal{S} embedded in \mathbb{E}^d , define its *distortion* $\kappa_{\mathfrak{d}}$ (with respect to
 802 \mathbb{E}^d) to be the minimum $\lambda \geq 1$ such that $\forall x, y \in \mathcal{S} : \frac{1}{\lambda}\|x - y\| \leq \mathfrak{d}(x, y) \leq \lambda\|x - y\|$. A $d \times d$
 803 matrix $M \in \mathbb{E}^d$ is *positive definite* if, for all $x \neq 0 \in \mathbb{E}^d$, $x^T M x > 0$. For a positive definite
 804 matrix M , define its *condition number* c_M to be the ratio of its maximum to its minimum
 805 eigenvalue.

806 For embedded metrics with bounded distortion, we have:

807 ► **Theorem 43.** *Given a metric \mathfrak{d} over \mathbb{T}^d with distortion $\kappa_{\mathfrak{d}} < \infty$, there exists an integer*
 808 *$m = m_{\mathfrak{d}} < (2\kappa_{\mathfrak{d}}\sqrt{d})^d$, such that the Delaunay triangulation over $(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathfrak{d})$ embeds in \mathbb{T}_m^d*
 809 *with the Euclidean metric. In particular, if \mathfrak{d} is of the form $\mathfrak{d}(x, y) = \sqrt{(x - y)^T M (x - y)}$,*
 810 *$x, y \in \mathbb{T}^d$, where $M \in \mathbb{E}^{d \times d}$ is a positive definite matrix having condition number at most c_M ,*
 811 *then $m \leq (2c_M\sqrt{d})^d$. Hence, given any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1/4]$, the statements of Theorems 9 and 11*
 812 *apply for ε -nets over the metric space $(\mathbb{T}^d, \mathfrak{d})$.*

813 For Theorem 43, we use a geometric condition of Caroli-Teillaud [11] (Criterion 3.11) to
 814 explicitly bound the multiplicity of the covering space.

815 **Proof of Theorem 43.** The action of \mathbb{Z}^d on \mathbb{E}^d is defined by translation, i.e. for $x \in \mathbb{E}^d$,
 816 $g \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $gx := g \cdot x = g + x$. For a finite point set $P \in \mathbb{E}^d$, let $\Delta(\mathbb{Z}^d P)$ denote the largest
 817 ball in \mathbb{E}^d containing no points from $\mathbb{Z}^d P$. Let $\delta((k\mathbb{Z})^d)$ denote the minimum distance by
 818 which a point in \mathbb{E}^d is translated by $(k\mathbb{Z})^d$. Finally, let $\pi(\cdot)$ denote the projection map of the
 819 covering space \mathbb{T}_k^d on to \mathbb{T}^d . We shall use the following geometric condition of Caroli and
 820 Teillaud [11].

821 ► **Lemma 44.** *If $\Delta(\mathbb{Z}^d P) < \delta((k\mathbb{Z})^d)/2$, then for any finite $Y \supset P$, the projection*
 822 *$\pi(\text{Del}(\mathbb{Z}^d Y))$ is a triangulation of \mathbb{T}^d .*

823 Now, observe that in the Euclidean metric, the diameter $\Delta_{\|\cdot\|}(\mathbb{Z}^d P)$ of the largest ball not
 824 containing any point from the set $\mathbb{Z}^d P$ is at most \sqrt{d} , with equality holding when $\sharp(P) = 1$,
 825 and that $\Delta(S') \leq \Delta(S)$ for any $S' \supseteq S$, since adding points can only decrease the diameter
 826 of the largest empty ball. Therefore, in the metric \mathfrak{d} , we have that

$$827 \quad \Delta_{\mathfrak{d}}(\mathbb{Z}^d P) \leq \Delta_{\|\cdot\|}(\mathbb{Z}^d P) \cdot \left(\max_{x,y \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x,y)}{\|x-y\|} \right).$$

828 By the previously observed bound on $\Delta_{\|\cdot\|}(\mathbb{Z}^d P)$, we have

$$829 \quad \Delta_{\mathfrak{d}}(\mathbb{Z}^d P) \leq \left(\max_{x,y \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x,y)}{\|x-y\|} \right) \cdot \sqrt{d}.$$

830 Also, letting $((k\mathbb{Z})^d)^*$ denote the non-identity elements of $(k\mathbb{Z})^d$,

$$831 \quad \delta_{\mathfrak{d}}((k\mathbb{Z})^d) = \min_{x \in \mathcal{G}, g \in ((k\mathbb{Z})^d)^*} \mathfrak{d}(x, gx) = \min_{x \in \mathcal{G}, g \in ((k\mathbb{Z})^d)^*} \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x, gx)}{\|x - gx\|} \cdot \|x - gx\|.$$

832 For the flat torus \mathbb{T}_k^d , $\min_{x,g} \|x - gx\| = k$. Therefore, in the metric \mathfrak{d} , the condition of
 833 Lemma 44 is satisfied if

$$834 \quad \max_{x,y \in \mathbb{Z}^d P} \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x,y)}{\|x-y\|} \cdot \sqrt{d} < \frac{1}{2} \left(\min_{x \in P, g \in ((k\mathbb{Z})^d)^*} \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x, gx)}{\|x - gx\|} \cdot \|x - gx\| \right), \text{ or,}$$

$$835 \quad 2\sqrt{d} \cdot \max_{x,y \in \mathbb{Z}^d P} \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x,y)}{\|x-y\|} \cdot \max_{x' \in P, g \in ((k\mathbb{Z})^d)^*} \frac{\|x' - gx'\|}{\mathfrak{d}(x', gx')} < k, \text{ which is true if}$$

$$836 \quad 2\sqrt{d} \cdot \max_{x,y \in \mathbb{Z}^d P} \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x,y)}{\|x-y\|} \cdot \min_{x',y' \in \mathbb{Z}^d P} \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x',y')}{\|x' - y'\|} < k, \text{ or,}$$

$$837 \quad 2\sqrt{d} \cdot \kappa_{\mathfrak{d}} < k,$$

838 since by definition, the distortion $\kappa_{\mathfrak{d}}$ satisfies for all $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d P$, $\mathfrak{d}(x, y) \leq \kappa_{\mathfrak{d}} \|x - y\|$, i.e.
 839 $\kappa_{\mathfrak{d}} \geq \max_{x,y \in \mathbb{Z}^d P} \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x,y)}{\|x-y\|}$, as well as $\|x - y\| \leq \kappa_{\mathfrak{d}} \mathfrak{d}(x, y)$, i.e. $\kappa_{\mathfrak{d}} \geq \min_{x,y \in \mathbb{Z}^d P} \frac{\mathfrak{d}(x,y)}{\|x-y\|}$.

840 Since the fundamental domain of \mathbb{T}_k^d contains k^d copies of the fundamental domain of \mathbb{T}^d ,
 841 we have $m \leq k^d$, and so the first part of the theorem follows with $m \leq (2\sqrt{d}\kappa_{\mathfrak{d}})^d$. The second
 842 part easily follows from the well-known linear algebraic facts that (a) $\max_{\|x\|=1} \{x^\top Mx\} =$
 843 $\max_{\|x\|=1} \{\|Ax\|\} = \sigma_{\max}(A)$, and that (b) $\min_{\|x\|=1} \{x^\top Mx\} = \sigma_{\max}(A^{-1}) = \sigma_{\min}(A)$ where
 844 A is such that $M = A^\top A$ and $\sigma_{\max}(A)$, $\sigma_{\min}(A)$ are respectively the largest and the smallest
 845 singular values of A . ◀

846 8 Conclusion and Remarks

847 In this paper, we analyzed the behaviour of the usual RIC algorithm for the Delaunay
 848 triangulation of nice point sets, focussing on the cases where the ambient space is the flat
 849 d -torus or a polyhedral surface in \mathbb{E}^3 . Similar questions can be asked for other spaces where
 850 the Delaunay triangulation is known to have low complexity for "nice" point sets.

851 We leave for further research, a more general analysis of RIC of Delaunay triangulations
 852 of cases such as polyhedral surfaces in higher dimensions, as well as extending the techniques
 853 developed in this paper to the RIC of other geometric problems.

854 — References —

- 855 1 N. Amenta and M. Bern. Surface Reconstruction by Voronoi Filtering. *Discrete & Com-*
 856 *putational Geometry*, 22(4):481–504, Dec 1999.

- 857 2 Nina Amenta, Dominique Attali, and Olivier Devillers. Complexity of Delaunay trian-
858 gulation for points on lower-dimensional polyhedra. In *18th ACM-SIAM Symposium on*
859 *Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1106–1113, 2007.
- 860 3 Nina Amenta, Sunghee Choi, and Günter Rote. Incremental constructions con BRIO. In
861 *Proc. 19th Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry*, pages 211–219, 2003. doi:
862 10.1145/777792.777824.
- 863 4 Dominique Attali and Jean-Daniel Boissonnat. A Linear Bound on the Complexity of
864 the Delaunay Triangulation of Points on Polyhedral Surfaces. *Discrete & Computational*
865 *Geometry*, 31(3):369–384, Feb 2004.
- 866 5 Dominique Attali, Jean-Daniel Boissonnat, and André Lieutier. Complexity of the Delaunay
867 Triangulation of Points on Surfaces: the Smooth Case. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth*
868 *Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry*, SCG '03, pages 201–210, New York, NY,
869 USA, 2003. ACM. URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/777792.777823>, doi:10.1145/
870 777792.777823.
- 871 6 Ludwig Bieberbach. Über die Bewegungsgruppen des n -dimensionalen euklidischen Raumes
872 mit einem endlichen Fundamentalbereich. *Göttinger Nachrichten*, 75, 1910.
- 873 7 Michel Boileau, Sylvain Maillot, and Joan Porti. *Three-dimensional orbifolds and their*
874 *geometric structures*. Société mathématique de France, 2003.
- 875 8 Jean-Daniel Boissonnat and Frédéric Cazals. Smooth surface reconstruction via natural
876 neighbour interpolation of distance functions. *Computational Geometry*, 22(1):185 – 203,
877 2002. 16th ACM Symposium on Computational Geometry.
- 878 9 Jean-Daniel Boissonnat, Olivier Devillers, and Samuel Hornus. Incremental construction of
879 the delaunay triangulation and the delaunay graph in medium dimension. In *Proceedings*
880 *of the Twenty-fifth Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry*, SCG '09, pages 208–
881 216, New York, NY, USA, 2009. ACM. URL: [http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1542362.](http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1542362.1542403)
882 1542403, doi:10.1145/1542362.1542403.
- 883 10 Jean-Daniel Boissonnat and Monique Teillaud. On the randomized construction of
884 the Delaunay tree. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 112:339–354, 1993. doi:10.1016/
885 0304-3975(93)90024-N.
- 886 11 Manuel Caroli and Monique Teillaud. Delaunay triangulations of closed Euclidean d-
887 orbifolds. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 55(4):827–853, 2016. URL: <https://hal.inria.fr/hal-01294409>, doi:10.1007/s00454-016-9782-6.
- 888 12 Keneth L. Clarkson and Peter W. Shor. Applications of random sampling in com-
889 putational geometry, II. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 4:387–421, 1989. doi:
890 10.1007/BF02187740.
- 891 13 M. Levitt D. Weiss, T. M. Raschke. How hydrophobic buckminsterfullerene affects sur-
892 rounding water structure. *Journal of Physical Chemistry*, 112(10):2981–2990, 2008.
- 893 14 Olivier Devillers. Randomization yields simple $o(n \log^* n)$ algorithms for difficult $\omega(n)$
894 problems. *International Journal of Computational Geometry and Applications*, 2(1):97–
895 111, 1992. URL: <https://hal.inria.fr/inria-00167206>.
- 896 15 Olivier Devillers. The Delaunay hierarchy. *International Journal of Foundations of Com-*
897 *puter Science*, 13:163–180, 2002. hal:inria-00166711.
- 898 16 R.A. Dwyer. The expected number of k -faces of a Voronoi diagram. *Computers & Math-*
899 *ematics with Applications*, 26(5):13 – 19, 1993.
- 900 17 Rex A. Dwyer. Higher-dimensional Voronoi diagrams in linear expected time. *Discrete &*
901 *Computational Geometry*, 6(3):343–367, Sep 1991.
- 902 18 Jeff Erickson. Nice Point Sets Can Have Nasty Delaunay Triangulations. In *Proceedings of*
903 *the Seventeenth Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry*, SCG '01, pages 96–105,
904 New York, NY, USA, 2001. ACM.
- 905

- 906 **19** Jeff Erickson. Dense Point Sets Have Sparse Delaunay Triangulations or “... But Not Too
907 Nasty”. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 33(1):83–115, Jan 2005.
- 908 **20** Gianni De Fabritiis, Peter V. Coveney, and Eirik G. Flekkøy. Multiscale dissipative particle
909 dynamics. *Philosophical Transactions: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*,
910 360(1792):317–331, 2002.
- 911 **21** E. N. Gilbert. Random subdivisions of space into crystals. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 33(3):958–
912 972, 09 1962.
- 913 **22** Mordecai J. Golin and Hyeon-Suk Na. On the average complexity of 3d-Voronoi diagrams
914 of random points on convex polytopes. *Computational Geometry*, 25(3):197 – 231, 2003.
- 915 **23** J. L. Meijering. Interface area, edge length, and number of vertices in crystal aggregates
916 with random nucleation. *Philips Research Reports*, 8:270–290, 1953.
- 917 **24** R. E. Miles. The random division of space. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 4:243–266,
918 1972.
- 919 **25** Gary L. Miller, Donald R. Sheehy, and Ameya Velingker. A fast algorithm for well-spaced
920 points and approximate delaunay graphs. In *Symposium on Computational Geometry 2013*,
921 *SoCG '13, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, June 17-20, 2013*, pages 289–298, 2013. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2462356.2462404>, doi:10.1145/2462356.2462404.
- 922 **26** J. Møller. Random tessellations in \mathbb{R}^d . *Advances in Applied Probability*, 21(1):37–73, 1989.
- 923 **27** Rajeev Motwani and Prabhakar Raghavan. *Randomized Algorithms*. Cambridge University
924 Press, New York, NY, USA, 1995.
- 925 **28** Ketan Mulmuley. *Computational geometry - an introduction through randomized algorithms*.
926 Prentice Hall, 1994.
- 927 **29** Vanessa Robins. Betti number signatures of homogeneous poisson point processes. *Phys.*
928 *Rev. E*, 74:061107, Dec 2006.
- 929 **30** Dafna Talmor. *Well-Spaced Points for Numerical Methods*. PhD thesis, School of Computer
930 Science, Carnegie Mellon University, 08 1997.
- 931 **31** William P Thurston. *Three-Dimensional Geometry and Topology, Volume 1*, volume 1.
932 Princeton university press, 2014.
- 933 **32** V. M. Tikhomirov. ϵ -Entropy and ϵ -Capacity of sets in functional spaces, pages 86–170.
934 Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 1993.
- 935 **33** Rien van de Weygaert, Erwin Platen, Gert Vegter, Bob Eldering, and Nico Kruithof. Alpha
936 shape topology of the cosmic web. In *Proceedings of the 2010 International Symposium on*
937 *Voronoi Diagrams in Science and Engineering*, ISVD '10, pages 224–234, Washington, DC,
938 USA, 2010. IEEE Computer Society.
- 939 **34** Wikipedia volume of an n -ball. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Volume_of_an_](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Volume_of_an_n-ball#Low_dimensions)
940 [n-ball#Low_dimensions](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Volume_of_an_n-ball#Low_dimensions).

942 **A** Appendix

943 Proofs from Section 1

- 944 ► **Lemma 45.** Given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, an ε -net \mathcal{X} over \mathbb{T}^d , of n points, a uniformly random sample
945 $S \subset \mathcal{X}$ of k points and $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon \sqrt[d]{n/k}$, then
- 946 (i) With high probability, there exists a ball of radius ε' with $\Omega(\log k / \log \log k)$ points in S .
- 947 (ii) With probability at least a constant, there exists a ball of radius $\Omega(\varepsilon' \log k)$ with no points
948 in S .

949 **Sketch of Proof.** The following balls-and-bins and coupon-collector arguments which can
950 be shown to prove this:

- 951 (i) Assuming the ε -net is over the unit cube or unit ball in \mathbb{E}^d , a volume argument gives
 952 that there are $\Omega(\varepsilon'^{-d}) = \Omega(k)$ disjoint balls of radius ε' , which will be our "bins". Now
 953 choosing k points from the n points in the ε -net is akin to throwing k packets into k bins
 954 - with high probability, the maximum load of a bin is $\Omega(\frac{\log k}{\log \log k})$, i.e. there exists a ball
 955 of radius ε' with $\Omega(\frac{\log k}{\log \log k})$ points.
- 956 (ii) Similarly, there are $\Omega(\varepsilon'/\log k) = \Omega(k/\log k)$ balls of radius $\varepsilon' \sqrt[d]{\log k}$ that cover the ε -net,
 957 and choosing k points from this covering, can be thought of as an instance of the coupon
 958 collector problem: we are allowed k draws (i.e. we choose k points), each draw is one of
 959 the "coupons" (i.e. the balls in the covering) with equal probability, and we want the
 960 probability that at least one coupon has not been collected, i.e. at least one ball from the
 961 covering has no point chosen from it. Now the well-known lower tail of the number of
 962 draws taken to collect all coupons in the coupon collector problem, gives that with
 963 high probability, for $k' = \Omega(k/\log k)$ coupons, and at most $O(k' \log k') = k$ draws, all
 964 coupons will not be collected, that is, some ball of radius $\Omega(\varepsilon' \sqrt[d]{\log k})$ will be empty.
 965 ◀

966 Proofs from Section 5

967 ▶ **Lemma 46.** *Given $a > 0$, $b \in (0, 1)$, the sum $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} 2^{an} \cdot \exp(-b \cdot 2^{an})$ is at most*
 968 $\frac{2 \log_2(1/b)}{eab}$.

969 **Proof of Lemma 46.** The proof follows from elementary calculus. The maximum term
 970 is when $2^{an} = 1/b$, i.e. $n = \frac{\log_2(1/b)}{a}$, and evaluates to $2^{an} \exp(-b \cdot 2^{an}) = \frac{1}{eb}$, and terms
 971 decrease exponentially afterwards. The sum is therefore upper bounded by twice the maximum
 972 term, times the number of terms before the maximum, which is the claimed bound. ◀