

## Walking in a Triangulation

Olivier Devillers, Sylvain Pion, Monique Teillaud

► **To cite this version:**

Olivier Devillers, Sylvain Pion, Monique Teillaud. Walking in a Triangulation. Proceedings of the 17th Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry, Jun 2001, Boston, United States. pp.106-114, 10.1145/378583.378643 . inria-00344519

**HAL Id: inria-00344519**

**<https://hal.inria.fr/inria-00344519>**

Submitted on 5 Dec 2008

**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.

# Walking in a triangulation\*

Olivier Devillers

Sylvain Pion

Monique Teillaud

## ABSTRACT

Given a triangulation in the plane or a tetrahedralization in 3-space, we investigate the efficiency of locating a point by walking in the structure with different strategies.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Given a triangulation  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $n$  vertices in the plane and a point  $p$ , finding the triangle of  $\mathcal{T}$  containing  $p$  is a fundamental problem in computational geometry. Several sophisticated structures exist to answer such location queries in optimal  $O(\log n)$  time [13, 9] but they are often too complicated and some practitioners may prefer to implement simpler techniques, such as traversing the triangulation using adjacency relations between triangles. This idea can be used directly to locate a point in a triangulation from a known starting point. It is also possible to choose a good starting point in some clever way [12, 10, 5].

There exists different strategies to find the triangle containing the query point  $p$  from the triangle containing a source point  $q$ . The simplest strategy, that we will call the *straight walk*, consists in visiting all triangles along the line segment  $qp$  [11]. A second strategy, the *orthogonal walk*, visits the triangles along an isothetic path moving from  $q$  to  $p$  by changing one coordinate at a time. Finally, we call *visibility walk* the following strategy, popular for the Delaunay triangulation: from a triangle  $t$  not containing  $p$ , we move to the neighbor of  $t$  through an edge  $e$  if the line supporting  $e$  separates  $t$  from  $p$ ; there may be one or two such edges for a triangle  $t$ , if there are two we may move to any of these two neighbors. This walk is used for the Delaunay triangulation because in that case it can be proved that it actually reaches the right triangle [7, 4, 8]. In the case of an arbitrary triangulation the walk may loop. We consider a variant of

\*INRIA - BP 93 - 06902 Sophia Antipolis CEDEX - France. [Firstname.Lastname@sophia.inria.fr](mailto:Firstname.Lastname@sophia.inria.fr). Fax: +33 4 92 38 76 43. <http://www-sop.inria.fr/prisme/>. This work was partially supported by the ESPRIT IV LTR Project No. 28155 (GALIA).

the visibility walk: the *stochastic walk* in which we decide that if we can choose between two neighbors of  $t$ , then the choice is done at random.

All these walking strategies generalize to higher dimensions.

The purpose of this paper is to study the performances of the different strategies from both theoretical and practical points of view, in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Hardly anything is known on this topic. The only theoretical result states that the number triangles visited by the straight walk in a Delaunay triangulation of  $n$  random points in the plane, to reach a point  $p$  from a point  $q$  is  $O(|qp|\sqrt{n})$ , where  $|qp|$  denotes the distance from  $q$  to  $p$  [2, 6].

We are interested in counting not only the number of simplices visited by a walk, but also the cost of visiting one simplex. We consider the robustness issues raised by the implementation of the different strategies.

Section 2 defines the framework of this study. Then we give a detailed description of the different strategies (Sections 3, 4 and 5) in dimensions 2 and 3 together with complexity results. We prove in Section 5.2 that the stochastic walk actually has a zero probability of looping forever, in any dimension. In Section 6 we present some experimental results on the implementation of the different strategies.

## 2. FRAMEWORK

Let  $S$  be a set of  $n$  points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $d = 2, 3$ . We will consider triangulations (simplicial complexes) whose domain covers the whole convex hull of  $S$ . All the simplices of a triangulation are positively oriented.

Given such a triangulation  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $S$ , we study different strategies to reach a query point  $p$  starting from a given starting vertex  $q$  of  $\mathcal{T}$ , walking in  $\mathcal{T}$  by using adjacency relations between the simplices of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

It is not straightforward to decide which strategy is the best one. The paths followed by the different strategies have different lengths in terms of number of simplices. The number of evaluations of *predicates* (simple geometric questions) when visiting a given simplex also depends on the strategy, as well as the nature itself of the predicates involved.

There are theoretical results on the number of triangles visited by the straight walk in the plane, but nothing is known

about the visibility walk.

The basic predicate in the straight walk (Section 3) and the visibility walk (Section 5) is the *orientation* predicate, which is defined over  $d + 1$  points by the sign of a  $d$  dimensional determinant, expressed below for 2 and 3 dimensions respectively:

$$\text{orientation}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = \text{sign} \left( \begin{vmatrix} \beta_x - \alpha_x & \gamma_x - \alpha_x \\ \beta_y - \alpha_y & \gamma_y - \alpha_y \end{vmatrix} \right)$$

$$\text{orientation}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta) = \text{sign} \left( \begin{vmatrix} \beta_x - \alpha_x & \gamma_x - \alpha_x & \delta_x - \alpha_x \\ \beta_y - \alpha_y & \gamma_y - \alpha_y & \delta_y - \alpha_y \\ \beta_z - \alpha_z & \gamma_z - \alpha_z & \delta_z - \alpha_z \end{vmatrix} \right)$$

When two points have all but one coordinate equal, the expression of *orientation* simplifies to a determinant of dimension  $d - 1$ . We take advantage of this in the orthogonal walk (Section 4), which uses mostly *comparisons of coordinates* in dimension 2 and more generally *lower dimensional orientation* predicates, which are faster and of course more robust than the full dimensional *orientation* tests, since they involve lower degree computations. The orthogonal walk only uses the  $d$  dimensional *orientation* predicate a constant number of times.

The algorithms also use basic operations such as:

- **neighbor(t through pq)** returns the triangle sharing edge  $pq$  with the triangle  $t$ .
- **l=vertex of t, l≠q, l≠r**; chooses  $l$  as the third vertex of a triangle whose two vertices are already known.

(the same notation will be used in the pseudo-code given in Appendix).

These two operations are similar in 3 dimensions for the neighbor of a tetrahedron or the fourth vertex of a tetrahedron. They need a constant number of pointers access or comparisons; the exact number depends on the internal representation of the triangulation, which may be any variant of the DCEL or may be based on simplices or vertices as in CGAL [1].

### 3. STRAIGHT WALK

#### 3.1 2 dimensions

This method consists in traversing all the triangles of the triangulation  $\mathcal{T}$  that are intersected by the line segment originating from a given vertex  $q$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  and ending at the query point  $p$ . This is performed using the adjacency relations between the triangles.

More precisely, the algorithm first performs an initialization step: from one triangle incident to  $q$  we turn around  $q$  until a triangle intersected by the ray  $qp$  is found. During this initialization step, one orientation test is needed for each visited triangle and the number of visited triangles is at most the degree of  $q$ , thus at most  $n$  triangles.

Once the initialization step is completed, the straight walk really starts. At a given step of the walk, we traverse some

triangle  $t$ , and the ray  $qp$  goes out of  $t$  through edge  $e$ . By testing on which side of  $e$  lies  $p$ , we decide if  $t$  contains  $p$  or if the walk must go on. In the later case, the walk goes to the neighbor of  $t$  through  $e$  and the new vertex of that triangle is located with respect to the line  $qp$  to decide by which edge of that triangle the ray  $qp$  goes out (see Figure 1-left). Therefore, the number of orientation tests performed for each visited triangle is exactly 2. The straight walk cannot visit the same triangle twice, thus the worst case length of a straight walk is at most the number of triangles of the triangulation which is less than  $2n$ .

Of course, visiting a linear number of triangles seems big, but the general idea of the walking strategy is that in practice you visit less triangles in a reasonable triangulation, although the  $2n + O(1)$  bound is tight, as shown by Figure 1-right. In the special case of Delaunay of points evenly distributed, it can be proven that the number of visited triangles during the walk is  $O(|pq|\sqrt{n})$  [2].

We give a pseudo-code for a detailed description of the walk (see Appendix).

#### 3.2 3 dimensions

The principle of the walk is similar in higher dimension although a little bit more intricate.

Given vertex  $q$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  and a query point  $p$ , the initialization step consists in finding the tetrahedron incident to  $q$  intersected by the ray  $qp$ , starting from another tetrahedron incident to  $q$ . This problem is in fact the 2 dimensional problem of locating the ray  $qp$  in the set of rays having  $q$  as origin and triangulated by the tetrahedra incident to  $q$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ . This initialization step is thus solved by the 2D Straight Walk algorithm. Notice that the orientation test for three rays emanating from  $q$  is the usual orientation test in three dimensions. The results of the previous paragraph on the number of visited triangles or the number of predicates per triangle apply here.

After this initialization, the main part of the walk begins. At a given step, we know that the ray goes out of some tetrahedron  $t$  by a facet  $e$ , then we must decide if the walk terminates in  $t$  by looking on which side of  $e$  lies  $p$  (see Figure 2). If the walk continues in the neighbor of  $t$  through  $e$ , then the ray  $qp$  goes out of that neighbor by a facet which is determined by two orientation tests involving  $q, p$ , the new vertex and a vertex of  $e$ .

Thus the number of orientation tests per visited tetrahedron is exactly 3. As in two dimensions, the number of visited tetrahedra is clearly bounded by the number of tetrahedra of  $\mathcal{T}$  since a tetrahedron cannot be visited twice. This number is quadratic in the worst case and a quadratic bound may be reached as shown by the example of Figure 3.

#### 3.3 Degenerate cases

The above algorithms do not handle degenerate cases. When the ray  $qp$  goes exactly through a vertex of the triangulation, or through an edge in 3D, the next cell traversed by the ray is not a neighbor of the previous one. In such a case, the algorithm must perform a kind of initialization step to be able to continue the walk.




Figure 1: The straight walk.




Figure 2: Straight walk in 3 dimensions (main loop).




Figure 3: A quadratic example for the straight walk in three dimensions.

Actually coding a robust version of the straight walk which handles degenerate cases yields to an intricate code.

## 4. ORTHOGONAL WALK

The cost of evaluating an orientation predicate increases with the dimension, thus an idea to improve the efficiency of the algorithm consists in decomposing the walk in pieces parallel to the coordinate axis and to get an *orthogonal walk* (see Figure 4 left).

If the ray  $pq$  is parallel to a coordinate axes, then the orientation tests of the straight walk involving both  $p$  and  $q$  become simpler as noticed in Section 2. This is the case of the orientation tests involved in the initialization phase and of the tests to decide by which edge of the triangle (*resp.* facet of the tetrahedron) the ray goes out. It remains one test per triangle (*resp.* tetrahedron) to decide if the walk ends in that tetrahedron; this test cannot be simplified in general, but a cheaper sufficient condition for the ray to continue can be evaluated first: if  $p$  is further than the triangle bounding box in the axis direction, then the walk continues and only otherwise the orientation test is performed.

In the worst case, the orthogonal walk can visit the same simplex at most  $d$  times, thus the worst case length of an orthogonal walk is trivially linear in the number of simplices of the triangulation. A bound of  $4n + O(1)$  can be reached in 2 dimensions (Figure 4 right). The orthogonal walk can be quadratic in 3 dimensions as shown by the example of Figure 3.

For the special case of the Delaunay triangulation of random points in the plane, the number of visited triangles during the walk is  $O((|p\alpha| + |\alpha q|)\sqrt{n})$  [2]. In the orthogonal walk, the dimension of the orientation tests decreases, compared to the straight walk, but the number of visited triangles increases. This increase can be estimated, in the case of a uniform distribution, by the average ratio between the length of the straight and the orthogonal walks over all directions, which is the average, on the unit sphere in  $d$  dimensions, of the sum of the absolute values of the coordinates, which can be shown to be  $4/\pi \approx 1.27$  in 2 dimensions, and  $3/2$  in 3 dimensions.

We give in Appendix a detailed pseudo code description of the algorithm in two dimensions. The two dimensional orientation tests are replaced by comparison of coordinates denoted by *below*, *above*, *left* or *right* in the pseudo code.

## 5. VISIBILITY AND STOCHASTIC WALKS

### 5.1 Description

The *visibility walk* is extremely simple. Let us describe it in 2D. The 3D case is similar, triangles just have to be replaced by tetrahedra and edges by facets. The algorithm starts from a triangle incident to the starting vertex  $q$ . Then, for each visited triangle  $t$ , the first edge  $e$  is tested. If the line supporting  $e$  separates  $t$  from  $p$ , which reduces to a single orientation test, then the next visited triangle is the neighbor of  $t$  through  $e$ . Otherwise, the second edge is tested in the same way. In case the test for the second edge also fails, then the third edge is tested. The failure of this third test means that the goal has been reached and that  $t$  contains  $p$ .




Figure 5: A cycle for the visibility walk.

In addition to its simplicity, the advantage of this walk is that it does not have to deal with degeneracies. If, for an edge  $e$ ,  $p$  lies on the supporting line of  $e$ , then the method will look at the next edge. At least one of the edges of each triangle is such that its supporting line strictly separates the triangle from the query point. The only degeneracies to be considered, namely the different cases when  $p$  lies on the boundary of a triangle, occur at the end of the walk, when the goal is reached.

The visibility walk is not completely specified: it depends on the implementation of the triangulation, since there is no intrinsic numbering of the edges of a triangle, no intrinsic definition of the “first” edge. The straight walk can be seen as a possible particular execution of the visibility walk algorithm. This is not the case for the orthogonal walk.

The visibility walk in a Delaunay triangulation always terminates, in any dimension [4]. Unfortunately, for non-Delaunay triangulations, the visibility walk may fall into a cycle, even in 2D, as illustrated by the famous example of Figure 5. Non-Delaunay triangulations (e.g. the constrained Delaunay triangulation) are also interesting in practice and they cannot be eluded. Therefore, to avoid infinite loops into cycles of non-Delaunay triangulations, a little bit of randomness can be introduced into the algorithm. As already noticed, the visibility walk depends on the numbering of the edges of the triangles. Using this degree of freedom, we may choose between different possible visibility walks.

The *stochastic walk* is obtained by replacing the access to the *first* edge of  $t$  by the access to a *random* edge of  $t$ . This ensures that, if the walk enters a cycle of the triangulation, it cannot loop into this cycle forever. The termination of the stochastic walk in any kind of triangulation will be proven in the next section.

The stochastic walk performs 1 to 3 orientation tests in each visited triangle. More precisely, suppose a triangle has only one edge whose supporting line separates it from  $p$ , then, this edge is chosen as the first one with probability  $1/3$ , and only one test is needed, the previous one is chosen with probability  $1/3$ , and two tests are performed, or the next one is chosen, and three tests are performed. This amounts




Figure 4: The orthogonal walk.

to  $1/3 \cdot 1 + 1/3 \cdot 2 + 1/3 \cdot 3 = 2$ . In the case when the triangle has two edges whose supporting lines separate it from  $p$ , the number of tests is  $2/3 \cdot 1 + 1/3 \cdot 2 = 4/3$ . Thus, the average number of orientation tests is less than 2, whereas it is 2 for the straight walk. Similar computations show that in 3D, the average number of tests is less than 2.5, whereas it is 3 for the straight walk.

A variant of the stochastic walk is the *remembering stochastic walk* whose pseudo-code is given in Appendix. In a given triangle, the visibility (stochastic or not) walk can test the edge where it comes from, and thus performs an orientation test that was already performed in the previous visited triangle. This can be avoided by remembering, for each visited triangle, the edge that was just crossed by the walk. Then, before testing an edge, it compares it with the remembered edge. This comparison consists of a constant number of comparison of pointers, as mentioned in Section 2. Computations analogous to the ones done above for the variant without memory lead to an average number of orientation tests less than 1.5 in two dimensions and less than 3 in three dimensions. It is not clear whether remembering the edge and performing the comparisons for each triangle is less expensive in practice than a useless orientation test in some triangles. The two variants will be compared experimentally in Section 6.

## 5.2 Expected validity of the stochastic walk

Let us analyze the algorithm in dimension  $d$ .

Given  $p$ , we define the directed graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , from  $\mathcal{T}$ , as follows. The nodes of  $\mathcal{G}$  are the simplices of  $\mathcal{T}$  (we will use the same notation for a simplex and its associated node), and there is an oriented arc from node  $t$  to node  $t'$  if the corresponding simplices are adjacent through a facet  $e$ , in such a way that  $t'$  and  $p$  lie on the same side of  $e$  (see Figure 6).

LEMMA 1. Given a facet  $e$  shared by simplices  $t$  and  $t'$




Figure 6: The directed graph  $\mathcal{G}$  of neighborhood relationships towards  $p$ .

and such that the arc of  $\mathcal{G}$  is oriented from node  $t$  to node  $t'$ , the probability that a stochastic path reaching  $t$  goes to  $t'$  is greater than  $\frac{1}{d+1}$ .

PROOF. If the path goes through  $t$ , then a facet of  $t$  having  $p$  on the other side must be chosen to continue the stochastic path.  $e$  may be chosen first, then the stochastic path uses it since  $p$  is on the good side of  $e$ ; this happens with probability  $\frac{1}{d+1}$  (the  $d+1$  facets have equal probability). If another facet is chosen first, then  $p$  may be on the wrong side and  $e$  can be chosen after; this happens with a probability depending of the geometric configuration, the probability is just lower bounded by zero to get the result of the lemma.  $\square$

THEOREM 2. Given a triangulation  $\mathcal{T}$  and a query point  $p$  in dimension  $d$ , the stochastic walk terminates with probability 1.

PROOF. The out-degree of a node of  $\mathcal{G}$  is between 1 and  $d$ . As noticed before, the graph  $\mathcal{G}$  may have cycles, but we will prove that the stochastic walk cannot cycle forever and will necessarily reach the only sink of the graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , i.e. the simplex  $S$  containing  $p$ .

Let us label all the nodes of  $\mathcal{G}$  by their distances to  $S$  in  $\mathcal{G}$ , where the distance between a node to  $S$  is the minimum number of arcs to be followed to reach  $S$  from this node (by the definition of  $\mathcal{G}$ , there is always a path from any node to  $S$ ). Then by construction, for any node  $t$  of label  $k$ , there exists an arc of  $\mathcal{G}$  from  $t$  to at least one node of label  $k-1$ . Thus if  $t$  is visited, then a node of label  $k-1$  is visited with probability higher than  $\frac{1}{d+1}$  by Lemma 1.

Assume that a stochastic walk visits  $N_k$  nodes of label  $k$ . Then  $N_{k-1} \geq \frac{N_k}{d+1}$  and by an immediate induction:  $N_k \leq (d+1)^k N_0$ . This relation clearly proves that  $N_0 \neq 0$ . So, the walk terminates and reaches  $S$ , which is the only node of label 0.  $\square$

Additionally, this proof yields an exponential bound on the length of the stochastic walk:

$$Cost \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\Delta} N_k \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\Delta} (d+1)^k \leq \frac{(d+1)^{\Delta+1}}{d}$$

( $N_0 = 1$ ) where  $\Delta$  is the maximal length (in terms of number of arcs) of a shortest path in  $\mathcal{G}$  from any node to  $S$ . Since the straight walk is a particular case of visibility walk,  $\Delta$  is bounded by the longest straight walk in the triangulation, that is  $\Delta = O(n)$  in two dimensions and  $\Delta = O(n^2)$  in three dimensions.

Unfortunately, for very special configurations of points, this exponential length of the stochastic walk can actually be reached.

The triangulation depicted on Figure 7 consists of one central triangle containing the point  $p$  to be located and  $k$  layers of cycles around it. These cycles go through a rectangle formed by  $k \times k^2$  small squares.

Any triangle having two outgoing arcs in graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , in this example, is as shown in Figure 7: the ingoing edge  $e$  is chosen first with probability  $1/3$ , then the walk must cross the next edge  $e'$ , which forces the walk to follow a cycle.  $e'$  can also be chosen first with probability  $1/3$ . So, the walk stays in the cycle with probability  $2/3$ . The edge  $e''$  allows the walk to leave the cycle. It is crossed only when it is chosen first, which occurs with probability  $1/3$ .

Let a stochastic walk start in triangle  $t$  defined in the figure. It reaches  $p$  through edge  $\alpha$  if, for each visited triangle, it chooses the edge out of the cycle, which occurs with probability  $(1/3)^k$ . It reaches  $p$  through edge  $\beta$  if it chooses  $i$  times the edge of the cycle, then it chooses the edge in the cycle, then it chooses  $k-i$  times the edge out of the cycle. This occurs with probability  $k \cdot (2/3) \cdot (1/3)^k$ . Analogously, it crosses edge  $\gamma$  with probability  $\binom{k+1}{2} \cdot (2/3)^2 \cdot (1/3)^k$ . Thus, the walk enters the  $k \times k^2$  rectangle by one of the  $k$  edges  $\delta$  with probability  $1 - (1/3)^k - k \cdot (2/3) \cdot (1/3)^k - \binom{k+1}{2} \cdot (2/3)^2 \cdot (1/3)^k$ .

Let us consider a path entering the rectangle through  $\delta$ . Giving a tight bound on the probability that such a path goes out of the rectangle through one edge of  $\varepsilon$  is quite complicated. Let us use a loose bound equal to  $(1/2)^{k-1}$ . If the path does not go out through  $\varepsilon$ , then it necessarily reaches its starting triangle  $t$ , and using the previous bound, this occurs with probability greater than  $1 - (1/2)^{k-1}$ . Summarizing, a path starting at  $t$  reaches  $t$  again with probability greater than

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{3^k} - k \frac{2}{3} \frac{1}{3^k} - \binom{k+1}{2} \frac{2^2}{3^2} \frac{1}{3^k}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{2k^2 + 8k + 9}{3^{k+2}} - \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}.$$

So, the expected number of times that  $t$  is visited is greater than  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{2k^2 + 8k + 9}{3^{k+2}} - \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}\right)^j = \frac{1}{\frac{2k^2 + 8k + 9}{3^{k+2}} + \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}}$ . The shortest cycle from  $t$  to  $t$  is obtained by traversing the triangles having a vertex on the convex hull of the points. Its length is  $k^2 + 2k + 6$ . So, we get an expected length for stochastic walk greater than  $\frac{k^2 + 2k + 6}{\frac{2k^2 + 8k + 9}{3^{k+2}} + \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}} \geq 2^{k+1}$ .

Moreover, this triangulation has  $(k+1)(k^2+1) + 2(k+1) \leq (k+1)^3$  vertices. Thus, we proved the following result:

**THEOREM 3.** *There exists a triangulation  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $n$  points in dimension 2 and a query point  $p$ , such that the expected length of the stochastic walk is greater than  $2^{\sqrt[3]{n}}$ .*

## 6. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We experimented different walking strategies for locating points in a Delaunay triangulation of 100,000 or 1,000,000 points evenly distributed in a square or in a cube (5 different sets in each case) and on a set of 145,300 points in three-dimensional space belonging to the boundary of a 3D object (these points have been measured by a 3D laser scanner on a dental prosthesis (courtesy of KREON Industrie). We then locate 100,000 random points to average the location time. The walk was performed in the standard way, starting the walk at some known vertex of the triangulation, or as a tool in the Delaunay hierarchy [5] which walks in a hierarchy of more and more refined samples; using this method, locating a query involves few ( $O(\log n)$ ) walks visiting a relatively small number of triangles.

The algorithms are coded in C++. The orientation tests use the usual floating point arithmetic. Robustness issues due to degenerate cases or rounded computations are solved by perturbation and static filtering, which do not have a significant influence on the running time for these random data.


For each strategy we count the number of visited triangles or tetrahedra ( $\#\Delta$ ), the number of full dimensional orientation predicates ( $\#\text{orient}$ ) and the running time (benchmarks on a Sun Ultra10 440MHz).

The four strategies presented above are compared in Table 1. In fact, since the tests were performed on Delaunay triangulations, the visibility walk (without randomness) does not cycle.

	Walk			Hierarchy		
	# $\Delta$ per point	#orient	$\mu S$	# $\Delta$ per point	#orient	$\mu S$
100,000 random points						
Stochastic 2D	356	611	229	23	49	41
Visibility 2D	360	617	216	23	44	39
Rem. stoch. 2D	356	611	242	23	49	42
Rem. visib. 2D	360	472	211	23	35	39
Straight 2D	332	664	240	20	42	43
Orthogonal 2D	424	3	212	27	9	43
Stochastic 3D	167	325	183	30	69	65
Visibility 3D	184	381	187	30	74	65
Rem. stoch. 3D	167	261	176	30	56	64
Rem. visib. 3D	184	301	178	30	59	66
Straight 3D	157	466	204	25	75	70
Orthogonal 3D	198	11	206	42	21	86
1,000,000 random points						
Stochastic 2D	1102	1880	793	29	61	48
Visibility 2D	1115	1897	771	29	56	47
Rem. stoch. 2D	1102	1880	843	29	61	49
Rem. visib. 2D	1115	1454	759	28	42	45
Straight 2D	1025	2051	825	24	52	50
Orthogonal 2D	1319	3	736	33	11	50
Stochastic 3D	335	641	402	35	80	82
Visibility 3D	359	736	420	36	87	81
Rem. stoch. 3D	335	516	392	35	65	81
Rem. visib. 3D	359	581	403	35	67	81
Straight 3D	309	919	438	31	91	86
Orthogonal 3D	417	12	452	48	21	109
dental prosthesis (145,300 points)						
Stochastic 3D	136	281	135	41	95	74
Visibility 3D	155	329	137	44	104	74
Rem. stoch. 3D	136	225	132	42	78	72
Rem. visib. 3D	155	261	130	44	82	72
Straight 3D	125	363	146	39	111	80
Orthogonal 3D	142	42	138	80	42	111

Table 1: Experimental results





**Figure 7: The stochastic walk may have exponential length.**

The running times of all strategies are of the same order.

The straight walk has the best performances in terms of visited simplices, both theoretically and experimentally, but it has the worst cost per triangle. Another drawback of the straight walk is the management of degenerate cases which make the code quite intricate, especially in three dimensions.

For walks of large length in terms of visited simplices, the orthogonal walk is faster. In fact it will be the right choice when using expensive arithmetic (e.g. multi-precision exact arithmetic).

## 7. CONCLUSION AND OPEN PROBLEMS

We presented four strategies for walking in a triangulation to locate a point: the straight walk, the visibility walk with or without memory, and the orthogonal walk. We studied them from both theoretical and practical points of view.

The best method to implement is the stochastic visibility walk, since it performs experimentally a little bit better than the straight and the orthogonal walks, and since it is easier to code and does not encounter any problem with degenerate cases. The orthogonal walk can also be considered when an expensive arithmetic is used or when a large number of simplices must be traversed.

Open questions remain about the stochastic visibility walk. We showed that it always terminates, but it can have an exponential complexity on cases that are very pathologic, both in the choice of the triangulation and in the choice of the query point. It might be possible to get results under some hypotheses on the triangulation and on the query point: Is the expected complexity in the case of a Delaunay trian-

gulation of  $n$  random points in dimension  $d$  equal to  $\sqrt[d]{n}$ ? Would it be possible to get an amortized complexity for the successive locations of  $n$  points incrementally inserted into a Delaunay triangulation?

## 8. REFERENCES

- [1] Jean-Daniel Boissonnat, Olivier Devillers, Monique Teillaud, and Mariette Yvinec. Triangulations in CGAL. In *Proc. 16th Annu. ACM Sympos. Comput. Geom.*, pages 11–18, 2000.
- [2] P. Bose and L. Devroye. Intersections with random geometric objects. Technical report, School of Computer Science, McGill University, 1995. Manuscript.
- [3] M. de Berg, M. van Kreveld, R. van Oostrum, and M. Overmars. Simple traversal of a subdivision without extra storage. *International Journal on Geographical Information Science*, 11:359–373, 1997.
- [4] L. De Floriani, B. Falcidieno, G. Nagy, and C. Pienovi. On sorting triangles in a Delaunay tessellation. *Algorithmica*, 6:522–532, 1991.
- [5] Olivier Devillers. Improved incremental randomized Delaunay triangulation. In *Proc. 14th Annu. ACM Sympos. Comput. Geom.*, pages 106–115, 1998.
- [6] Luc Devroye, Ernst Peter Mücke, and Binhai Zhu. A note on point location in Delaunay triangulations of random points. *Algorithmica*, 22:477–482, 1998.
- [7] H. Edelsbrunner. An acyclicity theorem for cell complexes in  $d$  dimensions. *Combinatorica*, 10(3):251–260, 1990.
- [8] Paul-Louis George and Houman Borouchaki. *Triangulation de Delaunay et maillage. Applications aux éléments finis*. Hermes, Paris, France, 1997.
- [9] D. G. Kirkpatrick. Optimal search in planar subdivisions. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 12(1):28–35, 1983.
- [10] C. Lemaire. *Triangulation de Delaunay et arbres multidimensionnels*. Thèse de doctorat en sciences, École des Mines de St-Etienne, France, 1997.
- [11] K. Mehlhorn and S. Näher. *LEDA: A Platform for Combinatorial and Geometric Computing*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1999.
- [12] Ernst P. Mücke, Isaac Saias, and Binhai Zhu. Fast randomized point location without preprocessing in two- and three-dimensional Delaunay triangulations. In *Proc. 12th Annu. ACM Sympos. Comput. Geom.*, pages 274–283, 1996.
- [13] F. P. Preparata. Planar point location revisited. *Internat. J. Found. Comput. Sci.*, 1(1):71–86, 1990.

## Appendix: pseudo-code

```

Algorithm 2D Straight Walk( $q, p$ )
// traverses the triangulation  $\mathcal{T}$ ,
// following the line segment from  $q$  to  $p$ .
//  $t = qrl$  is a triangle of  $\mathcal{T}$ .
if orientation(rqp) < 0 while orientation(lqp) < 0 {
    r = l;
    t = neighbor(t through ql);
    l = vertex of t,  $l \neq q$ ,  $l \neq r$ ; }
else do {
    l = r;
    t = neighbor(t through qr);
    r = vertex of t,  $r \neq q$ ,  $r \neq l$ ;
    } while orientation(rqp) < 0;
// end of initialization step
// now  $qp$  has  $r$  on its right and  $l$  on its left.
while orientation(prl) < 0 {
    t = neighbor(t through rl);
    s = vertex of t,  $s \neq r$ ,  $s \neq l$ ;
    if orientation(sq p) < 0 r = s; else l = s; }
// t contains p.

Algorithm 3D Straight Walk( $q, p$ )
// traverses the triangulation  $\mathcal{T}$ ,
// following the line segment from  $q$  to  $p$ 
//  $t = uvwq$  is a tetrahedron of  $\mathcal{T}$ .
if orientation(vuqp) > 0 while orientation(wuqp) > 0 {
    v = w;
    t = neighbor(t through qw);
    w = vertex of t,  $w \neq u$ ,  $w \neq v$ ,  $w \neq q$ ; }
else do {
    w = v;
    t = neighbor(t through quv);
    v = vertex of t,  $v \neq u$ ,  $v \neq w$ ,  $v \neq q$ ;
    } while orientation(vuqp) < 0;
// now  $v$  and  $w$  lie on opposite sides of plane  $uqp$ ,
//  $vuqp$  is positively oriented and  $wuqp$  negatively.
while orientation(vwqp) > 0 {
    t = neighbor(t through qwv);
    s = vertex of t,  $s \neq v$ ,  $s \neq w$ ,  $s \neq q$ ;
    if orientation(suqp) > 0 v = s; else w = s; }
u = vertex of t,  $s \neq v$ ,  $s \neq w$ ,  $s \neq q$ ;
// end of initialization step.
//  $qp$  intersects triangle  $uvw$ ,
//  $wuqp$ ,  $vuqp$  and  $uwqp$  are positively oriented.
while orientation(uwvp) > 0 {
    t = neighbor(t through uvw);
    s = vertex of t,  $s \neq u$ ,  $s \neq v$ ,  $s \neq w$ ;
    if orientation(usqp) > 0
        //  $qp$  does not intersect triangle  $usw$ ,
        if orientation(vsqp) > 0
            //  $qp$  intersects triangle  $usw$ ,
            u = s;
        else
            //  $qp$  intersects triangle  $usv$ ,
            w = s;
    else
        //  $qp$  does not intersect triangle  $usv$ ,
        if orientation(wsqp) > 0
            //  $qp$  intersects triangle  $usw$ ,
            v = s;
        else
            //  $qp$  intersects triangle  $usv$ ,
            u = s;
}
// t contains p.

```

```

Algorithm 2D Orthogonal Walk( $q,p$ )
// traverses the triangulation  $\mathcal{T}$ ,
//using the orthogonal walk from  $q$  to  $p$ ,
//  $t = qrl$  is a triangle of  $\mathcal{T}$ .
// wlog, we assume  $p$  is above and to the right of  $q$ .
 $\alpha = \text{point}(xp,yq)$ ;
if  $r$  below  $q$  while  $l$  below  $q$  {
     $r = l$ ;  $t = \text{neighbor}(t \text{ through } ql)$ ;  $l = \text{vertex of } t \neq qr$ ;}
else do {
     $l = r$ ;  $t = \text{neighbor}(t \text{ through } qr)$ ;  $r = \text{vertex of } t \neq ql$ ;
} while  $r$  above  $q$ ;
//  $q$  has  $r$  below and  $l$  above.
while (( $r$  and  $l$  at left of  $\alpha$ ) or  $\text{orientation}(\alpha rl) < 0$ ){
     $t = \text{neighbor}(t \text{ through } rl)$ ;
     $s = \text{vertex of } t \neq rl$ ;
    if  $s$  above  $q$   $l = s$ ; else  $r = s$ ; }
//  $\alpha$  inside  $t$ 
 $l = \text{vertex of } t \neq rl$ ;
 $r = \text{vertex of } t \neq rl$ ;
//  $p$  has  $r$  at right and  $l$  at left.
while (( $r$  and  $l$  below  $p$ ) or  $\text{orientation}(prl) < 0$ ) {
     $t = \text{neighbor}(t \text{ through } rl)$ ;
     $s = \text{vertex of } t \neq rl$ ;
    if  $s$  at left of  $p$   $l = s$ ; else  $r = s$ ;}
//  $t$  contains  $p$ .

```

```

Algorithm Remembering Stochastic Walk( $q,p$ )
// traverses the triangulation  $\mathcal{T}$ ,
//using the remembering stochastic walk
// from  $q$  to  $p$ .  $t = qrl$  is a triangle of  $\mathcal{T}$ .
previous= $t$ ; end=false;
while (not end) {
     $e = \text{random edge of } t$ ;
    if ( $p$  not neighbor of previous through  $e$ )
        and ( $p$  on the other side of  $e$ )
            {previous= $t$ ;  $t = \text{neighbor}(t \text{ through } e)$ ;}
    else {
         $e = \text{next edge of } t$ ;
        if ( $p$  not neighbor of previous through  $e$ )
            and ( $p$  on the other side of  $e$ )
                {previous= $t$ ;  $t = \text{neighbor}(t \text{ through } e)$ ;}
        else {
             $e = \text{next edge of } t$ ;
            if ( $p$  not neighbor of previous through  $e$ )
                and ( $p$  on the other side of  $e$ )
                    {previous= $t$ ;  $t = \text{neighbor}(t \text{ through } e)$ ;}
            else end=true;
        }
    }
}
//  $t$  contains  $p$ .

```