

On Greedily Packing Anchored Rectangles

A tale of crowns and tiles

Christoph Damerius ✉

Universität Hamburg, Germany

Peter Kling ✉ 

Universität Hamburg, Germany

Dominik Kaaser ✉ 

Universität Hamburg, Germany

Florian Schneider ✉

Universität Hamburg, Germany

Abstract

Consider a set P of points in the unit square \mathcal{U} , one of them being the origin. For each point $p \in P$ you may draw a rectangle in \mathcal{U} with its lower-left corner in p . What is the maximum area such rectangles can cover without overlapping each other?

Freedman [17] posed this problem in 1969, asking whether one can always cover at least 50% of \mathcal{U} . Over 40 years later, Dumitrescu and Tóth [11] achieved the first constant coverage of 9.1%; since then, no significant progress was made. While 9.1% might seem low, the authors could not find any instance where their algorithm covers less than 50%, nourishing the hope to eventually prove a 50% bound. While we indeed significantly raise the algorithm’s coverage to 39%, we extinguish the hope of reaching 50% by giving points for which the coverage is below 43.3%.

Our analysis studies the algorithm’s average and worst-case density of so-called tiles, which represent the area where a given point can freely choose its maximum-area rectangle. Our approach is comparatively general and may potentially help in analyzing related algorithms.

1 Introduction

The LOWER-LEFT ANCHORED RECTANGLE PACKING (LLARP) problem considers a finite set $P \subseteq \mathcal{U} := [0, 1]^2$ with $(0, 0) \in P$ of *input points*. The goal is to find a set of non-empty, interior-disjoint rectangles $(r_p)_{p \in P}$ with p being the lower-left corner of $r_p \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ and such that the total area $\sum_{p \in P} |r_p|$ is maximized.

This problem was first introduced by Freedman [17, Unsolved Problem 11, page 345] in 1969, who asked the question whether for any point set P , the rectangles can always be chosen such that they cover at least 50% of \mathcal{U} . It is easy to see that this is the best one can hope for, since putting n equally spaced points along the ascending diagonal of \mathcal{U} yields a maximum coverable area of $1/2 + o(1)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Over the years, the LLARP problem reoccurred in form of geometric challenges [13] or in miscellaneous books and journals about mathematical puzzles [18–20]. Still, it took more than 40 years until Dumitrescu and Tóth [11] made significant progress towards Freedman’s question: they considered a natural greedy algorithm and proved that it achieves a coverage of 9.1%. This caused a surge of interest in this old problem, resulting in numerous findings for variants or special cases of the problem (see Section 1.1). Still, no further significant progress was made towards the original question¹, and even the question whether a maximum covering can be found in polynomial time remains elusive.

While Dumitrescu and Tóth [11] themselves observed that “*a sizable gap to the conjectured 50% remains*”, they were unable to find instances where it *does not* reach 50%. This led them and others to conjecture a much better quality of their algorithm, making it a natural candidate to answer Freedman’s question positively, albeit [11] also mentioned that “*obtaining substantial improvements probably requires new ideas*”.

Our results indeed attest the greedy algorithm a much better coverage of 39%. However, at the same time we show that there are instances where the coverage stays below 43.3%.

¹ A very recent, still unpublished result slightly raised the greedy algorithm’s coverage to 10.39% [12].

1.1 Related Work

LLARP falls into the class of geometric packing problems, where a typical question is how much of a container can be covered using a set of geometric shapes in two or more dimensions. We concentrate on two dimensional packing problems with rectangular containers and shapes.

Complexity of LLARP. The above mentioned greedy algorithm by Dumitrescu and Tóth [11] considers the input points step by step from top-right to bottom-left, greedily choosing maximum-area rectangles in each step. It can be shown [11] that this is equivalent to partitioning the unit square into staircase-shaped *tiles*, one for each input point, and choosing maximal rectangles within each tile (see Section 2 for the formal algorithm description).

While the complexity of LLARP remains unknown, [11] also showed that there is an order of the input points for which the greedy algorithm achieves an optimal packing (albeit of unknown value); how to find that ordering remains unclear. Balas and Tóth [6] studied the combinatorial structure of optimal solutions, proving that the worst-case number of maximal rectangle packings is exponential in the number of input points.

LLARP Variants. After [11], a series of papers studied special cases and variants of LLARP. Balas et al. [7] allowed rectangles to be anchored in any of the four corners and showed that here the worst-case coverage lies in $[7/12, 2/3]$ and in $[5/32, 7/23]$ if the rectangles are restricted to squares. Akitaya et al. [4] improved the lower bound for such corner-anchored square packings to $1/2$ and proved that finding such a maximum packing is NP-hard. Interestingly, there is only one other LLARP-variant known to be NP-hard, namely if the rectangle’s anchors lie in their center [5]. Other results consider specific classes of input points, like points with certain increasing/decreasing structures [8] or points that lie on the unit square’s boundary (for corner-anchored rectangles) [9].

Further Problems and Applications. Further related problems include the maximum weight independent set of rectangles problem [1, 3, 10] (which was used, e.g., in [5] to derive a PTAS for center-anchored rectangle packings) or geometric knapsack [2, 16] and strip packing problems [14]. All of these differ from LLARP and its variants in that the size of the objects to be packed is part of the input and the object placement is typically less constrained.

Note that LLARP-like problems are not of pure theoretical interest, but have applications in, e.g., map labeling. Here, rectangular text labels must be placed under certain constraints (e.g., labels might be scalable but require a fixed ratio and must be placed at a specific anchor) within a given container. We refer to the relatively recent survey [15] for details.

1.2 Our Contribution and Techniques

We analyze the greedy TILEPACKING from [11] (formally described in Section 2). From a high-level view, TILEPACKING partitions the unit square into staircase-shaped *tiles*, each anchored at an input point, and chooses an area-maximal rectangle in each tile. A natural way to analyze such an algorithm is to consider tiles’ densities (the ratio between their area-maximal rectangles and their own area) and prove a lower bound on the *average* tile density (which immediately yields the covering guarantee). Indeed, intuitively there cannot be too many low-density tiles, as such tiles “use up” a comparatively large space.

Dumitrescu and Tóth [11] follow this approach by defining suitable charging areas C_t for each tile t (suitable trapezoids below/beneath the tile). We also use such a charging scheme, but rely on a much more complex charging area which we refer to as a tile’s *crown*. But instead of directly analyzing a tile’s charging area, we first extract the critical properties that determine the charging scheme’s quality. This general approach (described in Section 3)

requires a lower bound function ξ on the tile's *charging ratio* $|C_t|/|t|$ together with some simple properties (basically a form of local convexity characterizing the average tile density).

We derive such a lower bound and describe simple, symmetric tiles for which it is tight (Figures 8 and 9). We then take an arbitrary tile and show how to gradually transform it into one of these tiles without increasing its charging ratio. This established that ξ is indeed a lower bound and allows us to easily conclude the following theorem.

► **Theorem 1.** *For any input points, TILEPACKING covers at least 39% of the unit square.*

While the involved transformations to get from an arbitrary tile to a worst-case tile require some care, we showcase the versatility of our approach by first proving a slightly weaker bound of only 25% (Section 4.2). The analysis of this bound is not only much simpler but, in fact, takes us halfway to Theorem 1, as the ξ -bound used in this case (Proposition 10) is tight for high-density tiles and all that remains is to refine our bound for low-density tiles (Proposition 14).

Our second major result constructs an input instance (depicted in Figure 11) for which TILEPACKING covers significantly less than 50%.

► **Theorem 2.** *There is a set of input points P for which algorithm TILEPACKING covers at most 43.3% of the unit square.*

2 Preliminaries and Algorithm Description

Let $\mathcal{U} := [0, 1]^2$ denote the unit square. For a point $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$ define $x(p)$ and $y(p)$ as the x - and y -coordinates of p , respectively. For two points $p, p' \in \mathbb{R}^2$ we use the notation $p \preceq p'$ to indicate that $x(p) \leq x(p')$ and $y(p) \leq y(p')$. Similarly, $p \prec p'$ means that $x(p) < x(p')$ and $y(p) < y(p')$. The relations “ \succeq ” and “ \succ ” are defined analogously. For a set S we denote its closure by \bar{S} . If S is measurable, we use $|S|$ to denote its area.

To simplify some geometric constructions and arguments, we use the following line-notation: We define the line $\ell_q^+ \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ as the line through $q \in \mathbb{R}^2$ of slope $+1$. Similarly, we define the lines $\ell_q^-, \ell_q^\backslash$, and ℓ_q^\uparrow through q with slope $0, -1$, and ∞ , respectively. For lines of type $R \in \{ \swarrow, \uparrow \}$ we write $\ell_q^R < \ell_{q'}^R$ if $q' = q + (x, 0)$ with $x > 0$ and say ℓ_q^R is *left of* $\ell_{q'}^R$. Similarly, for lines of type $R \in \{ \searrow, - \}$ we write $\ell_q^R < \ell_{q'}^R$ if $q' = q + (0, y)$ with $y > 0$ and say ℓ_q^R is *below* $\ell_{q'}^R$. Analogous definitions apply for “ $>$ ”, “ \leq ”, and “ \geq ”.

Input Sets in General Position. Remember the problem description from Section 1. We say that the input set P is *in general position* if there are no two (different) points $p, p' \in P$ with $x(p) = x(p')$, $y(p) = y(p')$, or $x(p) + y(p) = x(p') + y(p')$. That is, no two points may share an x - or y -coordinate and may not lie on the same diagonal of slope -1 . W.l.o.g., we restrict P to be in general position (Lemma 16 in Appendix A explains why this is okay).

Tiles and Tile Packings. A *tile* $t \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ is a staircase polygon in \mathcal{U} (see Figure 1a). More formally, t is defined by its *anchor* $p \in \mathcal{U}$ and a set of k *upper staircase points* $\Gamma_t := \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k\} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{U}}$ ordered by increasing x -coordinate and such that $q_i \succ p$ for all q_i as well as $q_i \not\prec q_j$ for all $q_i \neq q_j$. Then $t = \{q \in \mathcal{U} \mid q \succeq p \wedge \exists q' \in \Gamma_t : q \prec q'\}$. A point $p_i = (x(q_{i-1}), y(q_i))$ is called a *lower staircase point*. We define $A_t \subseteq t$ as an (arbitrary) area-maximal rectangle in t and $\rho_t := |A_t|/|t|$ as the tile's *density*. For indexed upper staircase points q_i we often use the shorthands $x_i := x(q_i)$ and $y_i := y(q_i)$.

If p and Γ_t do not adhere to the above requirements ($q_i \succ p$ and $q_i \not\prec q_j$), but only to the slightly weaker requirements $q_i \succeq p$ $q_i \not\prec q_j$ for all $q_i \neq q_j$), then tile t is said to be *degenerate*. Such tiles have superfluous points in Γ_t and play a role in our analysis.




Figure 1 Tiles, packings, crowns, and towers. In our figures, tiles are shaded light blue. Upper and lower staircase points are shown in red and black, respectively. A dark blue rectangle represents a (maximal) rectangle of a tile. Crowns are shown in yellow and towers are possibly labeled.

The *hyperbola* of t is $h_t := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^2 \mid y = p + |A_t|/x\}$. Note that all upper staircase points lie between p and h_t . Moreover, the points from $\Gamma_t \cap h_t$ span all area-maximal rectangles in t . If, $p = (0, 0)$ and $|A_t| = 1$, then t is called *normalized*.

A *tile packing* of the unit square is a set \mathcal{T} of disjoint tiles such that $\bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} t = \mathcal{U}$. In particular, $\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} |t| = |\mathcal{U}| = 1$. We use $A(\mathcal{T}) := \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} |A_t|$ to denote the area covered by choosing an area-maximal rectangle A_t for each tile t (the *area covered by \mathcal{T}*).

A Greedy Tile Packing Algorithm. Let us revisit algorithm TILEPACKING by Dumitrescu and Tóth [11]. TILEPACKING processes the points from P from top-right to bottom-left. More formally, it orders $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$ such that $\ell_{p_i}^\wedge \geq \ell_{p_{i+1}}^\wedge$. It then defines for each $p_i \in P$ the tile $t_i := \{q \in \mathcal{U} \mid q \succeq p_i\} \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} t_j$, yielding a tile packing $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n\}$. To build its solution to LLARP, TILEPACKING picks for each $p \in P$ the rectangle r_p as an (arbitrary) area-maximal rectangle $A_t \subseteq t$ in the tile t containing p . Thus, the total area covered by TILEPACKING is $A(\mathcal{T})$. Figure 1b illustrates the resulting tile packing.

Note that by this construction, the lower staircase points of each tile t are input points. Moreover, as already mentioned in Dumitrescu and Tóth [11], for each tile we can define a certain *exclusive area* that does not contain an input point.

► **Observation 3.** Consider the tile packing \mathcal{T} produced by TILEPACKING for a set of input points P . Fix a tile $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and let $p \in P$ denote its anchor point. Then the tile’s *exclusive area* $E_t := \{q \in \mathcal{U} \mid \ell_q^\wedge > \ell_p^\wedge \wedge \exists q' \in \Gamma_t: q \prec q'\}$ does not contain any input point from P .

This observation follows by noting that any such input point $p' \in E_t$ would be processed before p by TILEPACKING and “shield” at least one upper staircase point $q' \in \Gamma_t$ from p , preventing it from becoming an upper staircase point of tile t .

3 A General Approach for Lower Bounds

Here we present a general approach to derive lower bounds for the area covered by a given tile packing \mathcal{T} . Our approach relies on a suitable *charging scheme* $(c_t)_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ that charges the area of each tile $t \in \mathcal{T}$ to a *charging area* $c_t > 0$. We define $c^* := \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} c_t$ as the total charged area and $c_t/|t|$ as the *charging ratio* of tile t .

Assume we are given a piecewise differentiable function $\xi: (0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a value $\rho^* \in (0, 1]$ with the following properties:

- ξ is point-convex in ρ^* (see [Definition 17](#)) with $\xi'(\rho^*) < 0$,
- $\xi(\rho^*)$ is an upper bound on the total charged area c^* , and
- for any $t \in \mathcal{T}$ the value $\xi(\rho_t)$ is a lower bound on t 's charging ratio $c_t/|t|$.

The following lemma then uses ξ to show that ρ^* is a lower bound on the area covered by \mathcal{T} .

► **Lemma 4.** *Consider a tile packing \mathcal{T} with a charging scheme $(c_t)_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ together with a function ξ and a value ρ^* as described above. Then \mathcal{T} covers an area of at least ρ^* .*

Proof. Since ξ is point-convex in ρ^* , we get for the tangent $\tau(\rho) := \xi(\rho^*) + \xi'(\rho^*) \cdot (\rho - \rho^*)$ of ξ in ρ^* that $\tau(\rho) \leq \xi(\rho)$ for all $\rho \in (0, 1]$. Using $A(\mathcal{T}) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} |A_t| = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} |t| \cdot \rho_t$, the linearity of τ and the properties of ξ we calculate

$$\tau(A(\mathcal{T})) = \tau\left(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} |t| \cdot \rho_t\right) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} |t| \cdot \tau(\rho_t) \leq \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} |t| \cdot \xi(\rho_t) \leq \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} |t| \cdot \frac{c_t}{|t|} = c^* \leq \xi(\rho^*). \quad (1)$$

On the other hand, by definition of τ , we have $\tau(A(\mathcal{T})) = \xi(\rho^*) + \xi'(\rho^*) \cdot (A(\mathcal{T}) - \rho^*)$. Combining this with [Equation \(1\)](#) and rearranging yields $\xi'(\rho^*) \cdot A(\mathcal{T}) \leq \xi'(\rho^*) \cdot \rho^*$, which yields the desired result after dividing by $\xi'(\rho^*) < 0$. ◀

4 Charging Scheme and Weak Covering Guarantee

This section introduces the charging scheme we will use to derive our lower bounds for the area covered by the greedy algorithm TILEPACKING (via the approach presented in [Section 3](#)). Afterward we derive a first, simple lower bound $\xi_w : (0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ on the tiles' charging ratios (as described in [Section 3](#)) and prove that it has the properties necessary to apply [Lemma 4](#). While comparatively simple, this already yields that TILEPACKING covers at least a quarter of the unit square, almost tripling the original guarantee from [\[11\]](#). [Section 5](#) will refine ξ_w in order to derive our main result ([Theorem 1](#)).

4.1 Charging Scheme


Given a tile packing \mathcal{T} from TILEPACKING, our charging scheme defines an area C_t for each tile $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and charges t 's area to $c_t := |C_t|$. We first explain how C_t is constructed from t . Afterward, we prove useful properties about these areas and their relation to \mathcal{T} .

Construction of C_t . Consider three points $p, q_1 = (x_1, y_1), q_2 = (x_2, y_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $q_1, q_2 \succeq p$, $x_1 \leq x_2$, and $y_1 \geq y_2$. Let $p' = (x_1, y_2)$. The tower $T_p(q_1, q_2)$ with base point p and peak p' is the rectangle formed by the lines ℓ_p^\setminus (the tower's base), ℓ_{q_1}' (the tower's left side), $\ell_{q_{i+1}}'$ (the tower's right side), and $\ell_{p_i}^\setminus$ (the tower's top). If the subscript p is omitted, the base point is assumed to be the origin $(0, 0)$.


To define a tile's charging area, fix a tile t with anchor p and $\Gamma_t = \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k\}$ ordered by increasing x -coordinate. The charging area of tile t is $C_t := \bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} T_p(q_i, q_{i+1})$. We refer to C_t as the crown of tile t . See [Figure 1c](#) for an illustration of a tile's towers and crown.

The width and height of a tower $T_p(q_1, q_2)$ correspond to the side lengths of isosceles triangles (see [Figure 2](#)), which yields a formula for $|T_p(q_1, q_2)|$. By taking derivatives, we also get formulas for the change when moving q_1 or q_2 horizontally or vertically.

► **Observation 5.** Consider $T_p(q_1, q_2)$ with $q_j - p = (x_j, y_j)$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Let $w_2 := x_2 - x_1$, and $h_1 := y_1 - y_2$. Then $|T_p(q_1, q_2)| = (x_1 + y_2) \cdot (w_2 + h_1)/2$.



■ **Figure 2** $|T_p(q_1, q_2)|$ is computed via the catheti of the blue triangles.



■ **Figure 3** Example for Lemma 7. The shown tower overlap has $p'_* \in E_t$, violating t 's exclusive area.

► **Observation 6.** Consider $T_p(q_1, q_2)$ with $q_j - p = (x_j, y_j)$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Let $w_2 := x_2 - x_1$, and $h_1 := y_1 - y_2$. Fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and consider the change of $|T_p(q_1, q_2)|$ if either q_1 or q_2 are moved horizontally or vertically as a linear function of ϵ :

- (a) If either $q_1(\epsilon) := q_1 + (0, \alpha \cdot \epsilon)$ or $q_2(\epsilon) := q_2 + (\alpha \cdot \epsilon, 0)$, then $\partial|T_p(q_1, q_2)|/\partial\epsilon = \alpha \cdot (x_1 + y_2)/2$ and $\partial^2|T_p(q_1, q_2)|/\partial\epsilon^2 = 0$.
- (b) If either $q_1(\epsilon) := q_1 + (\alpha \cdot \epsilon, 0)$ or $q_2(\epsilon) := q_2 + (0, \alpha \cdot \epsilon)$, then $\partial|T_p(q_1, q_2)|/\partial\epsilon = \alpha \cdot (w_2 + h_1 - (x_1 + y_2))/2$ and $\partial^2|T_p(q_1, q_2)|/\partial\epsilon^2 = -\alpha^2$.

Properties of the Charging Scheme. The following results capture basic properties of our charging scheme. First, we show that the defined charging areas are disjoint.

► **Lemma 7.** Consider the tile packing \mathcal{T} produced by algorithm TILEPACKING for a set of input points P . For any two different tiles $t, t' \in \mathcal{T}$, we have $C_t \cap C_{t'} = \emptyset$.


Proof. Fix $t, t' \in \mathcal{T}$ and let $p, p' \in P$ denote their respective anchors. W.l.o.g., assume $\ell_p^\setminus > \ell_{p'}^\setminus$, such that TILEPACKING processes p before p' . As crowns consist of towers, it is sufficient to show $T_p(q_1, q_2) \cap T_{p'}(q'_1, q'_2) = \emptyset$ for neighboring $q_1, q_2 \in \Gamma_t$ and $q'_1, q'_2 \in \Gamma_{t'}$. Let $p_* \in P$ and $p'_* \in P$ denote these towers' respective peak. W.l.o.g., we assume $\ell'_{p_*} < \ell'_{p'_*}$ (p_* lies left of $\ell'_{p'_*}$); the other case follows symmetrically.

If $\ell'_{p'_*} < \ell'_{p_*}$, the towers are separated (the top of $T_{p'}(q'_1, q'_2)$ lies below the base of $T_p(q_1, q_2)$) and cannot intersect. So assume $\ell'_{p'_*} > \ell'_{p_*}$. Then we cannot have $p'_* \prec q_2$, since this would imply that p'_* lies in the exclusive area of t , violating Observation 3.


Let $\Delta_y := q'_1 - p'_*$ and note that $x(\Delta_y) = 0$. Define $\tilde{q}_1 := p_* - \Delta_y$ and note that $p'_* \neq \tilde{q}_1$, since otherwise $q'_1 = p'_* + \Delta_y \succ \tilde{q}_1 + \Delta_y = p_*$, which (together with $\ell'_{p'_*} > \ell'_{p_*} > \ell'_{p'}$) would mean that p_* lies in the exclusive area of t' (again violating Observation 3).

So $\ell'_{p'_*} > \ell'_{p_*}$, $p'_* \neq q_2$, and $p'_* \neq \tilde{q}_1$. Together, these imply $x(p'_*) > x(q_2)$ and $y(p'_*) < y(\tilde{q}_1)$, which in turn imply $\ell'_{p'_*} > \ell'_{q_2 - \Delta_y}$ (see Figure 3). But then, the towers are separated, since $\ell'_{q'_1} = \ell'_{p'_* + \Delta_y} > \ell'_{q_2 - \Delta_y + \Delta_y} = \ell'_{q_2}$ ($T_p(q_1, q_2)$'s right side lies left of $T_{p'}(q'_1, q'_2)$'s left side). ◀

The next lemma's proof shows that all crowns lie inside a pentagon formed by \mathcal{U} and two isosceles triangles left and below of \mathcal{U} (see Figure 4). With Lemma 7 this implies that the total charging area is bounded by the pentagon's area.



■ **Figure 4** Pentagon \diamond and point set P_ϵ from Lemma 8.



■ **Figure 5** Removing superfluous points from Γ_t reduces $|C_t|$ by the rectangle between l'_{q_i} , $l'_{q_{i+1}}$, l_{q_i} , and $l_{p_{i-1}}$.

► **Lemma 8.** *Consider the tile packing \mathcal{T} produced by algorithm TILEPACKING for a set of input points P . The total charging area of \mathcal{T} is $c^* \leq 3/2$. Moreover, this bound is tight, since there are arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$ and input points P_ϵ for which $c^* \geq 3/2 - \epsilon$.*

Proof. Define the points SW := (0, 0), NW := (0, 1), and SE := (1, 0). Let \diamond denote the pentagon enclosed by the lines l_{SW}^{\setminus} , l_{NW}^{\setminus} , l_{SE}^{\setminus} , l_{NW}^{\setminus} , and l_{SE}^{\setminus} (see Figure 4). Since $|\diamond| = 3/2$ and using Lemma 7, it is sufficient to show that $C_t \subseteq \diamond$ for any $t \in \mathcal{T}$. For this, in turn, it is sufficient to show that any tower $T_p(q_1, q_2)$ of C_t lies in \diamond .

Fix such a tower $T_p(q_1, q_2)$. Since $p \succ$ SW, we have $l_p^{\setminus} \geq l_{SW}^{\setminus}$ (the base of $T_p(q_1, q_2)$ lies above the base of \diamond). Similarly, since $q_1, q_2 \in \overline{U} \subseteq \diamond$, we have $l'_{q_1} \geq l_{NW}^{\setminus}$ (the left side of $T_p(q_1, q_2)$ lies right of the left side of \diamond) and $l'_{q_2} \leq l_{SE}^{\setminus}$ (the right side of $T_p(q_1, q_2)$ lies left of the right side of \diamond). Finally, the topmost point $q_1 \in \overline{U}$ of $T_p(q_1, q_2)$ lies below l_{NW}^{\setminus} and the rightmost point $q_2 \in \overline{U}$ of $T_p(q_1, q_2)$ lies to the left of l_{SE}^{\setminus} . Together, we get $T_p(q_1, q_2) \subseteq \diamond$.

For the tightness of the bound, choose $\epsilon > 0$ with $1/\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$. Define $P_\epsilon = \{\text{SW}\} \cup \{(k \cdot \epsilon, 1 - k \cdot \epsilon^2), (1 - k \cdot \epsilon^2, k\epsilon) \mid k \in \{1, 2, \dots, 1/\epsilon - 1\}\}$. As illustrated in Figure 4, the crown of tile t with anchor SW converges towards \diamond as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, such that $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} |C_t| = 3/2$. ◀

4.2 Weak Covering Guarantee for Greedy Tile Packings

This section proves the following, slightly weaker version of Theorem 1:

► **Theorem 9.** *For any input points, TILEPACKING covers at least 25% of the unit square.*

Proving this not only serves as a warm-up to illustrate our approach before proving our main result but – as we will see in Section 5 – brings us halfway towards proving Theorem 1.


So consider a tile packing \mathcal{T} produced by TILEPACKING for some set of input points P . To prove Theorem 9 we follow the approach outlined in Section 3, using the charging scheme from Section 4.1. That is, the area of $t \in \mathcal{T}$ is charged to $c_t = |C_t|$, where C_t represents the crown of t . To this end, define $\rho^* := 1/4$ and the *weak charging ratio bound*

$$\xi_w : (0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \quad \xi_w(\rho) := 2 \cdot (1 - \rho). \quad (2)$$


As a linear function, ξ_w is trivially point-convex in ρ^* . Moreover, $\xi_w(\rho^*) = 3/2$ and thus, by Lemma 8, $\xi_w(\rho^*) \geq c^*$. In the remainder of this section we prove the following proposition, stating that ξ_w represents a lower bound on the charging ratio of any $t \in \mathcal{T}$.

► **Proposition 10.** *For any tile t we have $c_t/|t| \geq \xi_w(\rho_t)$.*

Once this is proven, Theorem 9 follows immediately by applying Lemma 4.



■ **Figure 6** Moving inner points in Lemma 13. Note that $\alpha_j > 0$ and $\alpha_i < 0$ in this case.



■ **Figure 7** Notation for Proposition 10 with $k = 3$ and $m = 5$.

A Lower Bound on the Charging Ratio. To prove that $\xi_w(\rho_t)$ lower bounds the charging ratio $c_t/|t|$ of any tile $t \in \mathcal{T}$, we gradually transform t into a “simpler” tile \tilde{t} . Our transformations ensure $\rho_{\tilde{t}} = \rho_t$ and $c_{\tilde{t}}/|\tilde{t}| \leq c_t/|t|$. Eventually, \tilde{t} will be simple enough to directly prove $c_{\tilde{t}}/|\tilde{t}| \geq \xi_w(\rho_{\tilde{t}})$. The following notation expresses progress via such a transformation:

$$\tilde{t} \preceq t \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad \rho_{\tilde{t}} = \rho_t \text{ and } c_{\tilde{t}}/|\tilde{t}| \leq c_t/|t|. \quad (3)$$

As a simple example, note that both a tile’s density and charging-ratio are invariant under translation and concentric scaling w.r.t. its anchor. This gives rise to the following transformation, which allows us to restrict our analysis to normalized tiles.

► **Observation 11.** For a tile t , let \tilde{t} denote the translation of t such that it is anchored in the origin and scaled by $1/|A_t|$ around the origin. Then $\tilde{t} \preceq t$. We call \tilde{t} the *normalization* of t .

Consider a tile t with anchor p . A transformation may move one of t ’s upper staircase points to the same x - or y -coordinate as another point from $\Gamma_t \cup \{p\}$, resulting in a degenerate tile with superfluous points in Γ_t (see Section 2). The next lemma states that removing such superfluous points maintains an “equivalent” tile with a smaller crown.

► **Lemma 12.** Consider a degenerate tile t . The pruned tile \tilde{t} with the same anchor but with $\Gamma_{\tilde{t}} := \{q \in \Gamma_t \mid \nexists q' \in \Gamma_t : q \preceq q'\}$ covers the same points, is non-degenerate, and $c_{\tilde{t}} \leq c_t$.

Proof. Order $\Gamma_t = \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k\}$ by non-decreasing x -coordinate and let $q_0 = q_{k+1} = p$. W.l.o.g. assume there is some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ with $y(q_i) = y(q_{i+1})$; the case of identical x -coordinates follows analogously. Let \tilde{t} denote the (possibly still degenerate) tile with anchor p and $\Gamma_{\tilde{t}} = \Gamma_t \setminus \{q_i\}$. Note that $\{q \in \mathcal{U} \mid q \succeq p \wedge q \prec q_i\} \subseteq \{q \in \mathcal{U} \mid q \succeq p \wedge q \prec q_{i+1}\}$, which implies $\tilde{t} = t$ and, thus, $\rho_{\tilde{t}} = \rho_t$. Removing q_i affects the towers $T_p(q_{i-1}, q_i)$ with peak p_{i-1} and $T_p(q_i, q_{i+1})$ with peak q_i . Figure 5 illustrates the situation.

We now show that $c_{\tilde{t}} \leq c_t$, such that $\tilde{t} \preceq t$; the lemma’s statement then follows by iteration. If $i = k$, then $c_{\tilde{t}} = c_t - |T(q_{i-1}, q_i)| \leq c_t$. So assume $i < k$. Then $c_{\tilde{t}} = c_t - |\square| \leq c_t$, where \square is the rectangle enclosed by the lines ℓ'_{q_i} , $\ell'_{q_{i+1}}$, ℓ_{q_i} , and $\ell_{p_{i-1}}$ (see Figure 5). ◀

For the next transformation, remember that the hyperbola h_t of a normalized tile t contains exactly those upper staircase points $q \in \Gamma_t$ that form maximal rectangles in the tile. We now prove that we can transform t such that at most one $q \in \Gamma_t$ lies not on h_t .

► **Lemma 13.** *A normalized tile t can be transformed into a tile $\tilde{t} \preceq t$ with $|\Gamma_{\tilde{t}} \setminus h_{\tilde{t}}| \leq 1$.*

Proof. Assume $|\Gamma_t \setminus h_t| > 1$ and order $\Gamma_t = \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k\}$ by increasing x -coordinate. To simplify border cases, define $q_0 = q_1$ and $q_{k+1} = q_k$. Choose $q_i, q_j \in \Gamma_t \setminus h_t$ with $i < j$. Consider the transformation $q_i(\epsilon) := q_i + (0, \alpha_i \cdot \epsilon)$ and $q_j(\epsilon) := q_j + (\alpha_j \cdot \epsilon, 0)$ with $\alpha_i, \alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the tile and crown areas become functions $t(\epsilon)$ and $c_t(\epsilon)$ of ϵ . We show that there are non-zero α_i, α_j such that $t(\epsilon)$ and, thus, ρ_t remain constant and $c_t(\epsilon)$ does not increase. Eventually, this results in a tile $\tilde{t} \preceq t$ that has an additional point on h_t or that has a degenerate staircase point which we can remove by [Lemma 12](#). In both cases $|\Gamma_t \setminus h_t|$ is reduced and the lemma follows by iteration. [Figure 6](#) illustrates the transformation.

The transformation changes only the towers $T(q_{i-1}, q_i)$, $T(q_i, q_{i+1})$, $T(q_{j-1}, q_j)$, and $T(q_j, q_{j+1})$. For $l \in \{0, 1, \dots, k+1\}$ let $q_l = (x_l, y_l)$ and define $w_l := x_l - x_{l-1}$ for $l \neq 0$ and $h_l := y_l - y_{l+1}$ for $l \neq k+1$. Then the transformation changes the tile according to $t'(\epsilon) = \alpha_i \cdot w_i + \alpha_j \cdot h_j$. To keep t constant we make this zero by setting $\alpha_j = -\alpha_i \cdot w_i/h_j$.

It remains to find a non-zero α_i such that $c_t(\epsilon)$ is non-increasing in ϵ . For this let $T_i(\epsilon) := |T(q_{i-1}, q_i)| + |T(q_i, q_{i+1})|$ and define $T_j(\epsilon)$ analogously. By [Observation 6](#), $T_l''(\epsilon) = -\alpha_l^2$ for $l \in \{i, j\}$. This yields $c_t''(\epsilon) = -\alpha_i^2 - \alpha_j^2 = -\alpha_i^2 \cdot (1 + w_i^2/h_j^2) < -\alpha_i^2$, a negative constant. This allows us to choose $\alpha_i \in \{-1, +1\}$ such that $c_t(\epsilon)$ is non-increasing. ◀

With these results, we are ready to prove our first covering guarantee for TILEPACKING.

Proof of Proposition 10. Consider an arbitrary tile t . By [Observation 11](#) and [Lemma 13](#), we can assume that t is normalized and that $|\Gamma_t \setminus h_t| \leq 1$. If $|\Gamma_t \setminus h_t| = 1$, let q_0 be that point, otherwise choose $q_0 \in \Gamma_t$ arbitrarily. Order $\Gamma_t = \{q_{-l}, \dots, q_k\}$ by increasing x -coordinate. To simplify border cases, define $q_{-l-1} = q_l$ and $q_{k+1} = q_k$. To ease the notation, for $i \in \{-l-1, \dots, k+1\}$ we let $q_i = (x_i, y_i)$. We furthermore define $w_i := x_i - x_{i-1}$ for $i \neq -l$ and $h_i := y_i - y_{i+1}$ for $i \neq k+1$. For $i \in \{-l, \dots, k\}$ inductively define $R_i := \{q \in t \mid q \prec q_i\} \setminus \bigcup_{|j| < i} R_j$. Finally, for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ let $T_i := T(q_{i-1}, q_i)$ and for $i \in \{-l, \dots, -1\}$ let $T_i := T(q_i, q_{i+1})$. See [Figure 7](#) for an illustration.

Note that $c_t = \sum_{i=-l}^{-1} |T_i| + \sum_{i=1}^k |T_i|$ and $|t| = \sum_{j=-l}^k |R_j|$. We will first show that for $i \in \{-l, \dots, k\} \setminus \{-1, 0, 1\}$ we have $|T_i| \geq 2|R_i|$. Afterward, we show $|T_{-1}| + |T_1| \geq 2|R_{-1}| + 2|R_{-1}| + 2|R_0| - 2$. With these inequalities and since $\rho_t = |A_t|/|t| = 1/|t|$ due to the normalization, the desired statement follows via

$$c_t = \sum_{i=-l}^{-1} |T_i| + \sum_{i=1}^k |T_i| \geq \sum_{i=-l}^k 2|R_i| - 2 = 2|t| - 2 = 2|t| \cdot (1 - \rho_t) = |t| \cdot \xi_w(\rho_t). \quad (4)$$

We now show the above bounds, starting with $|T_i| \geq 2|R_i|$ for $|i| > 1$. W.l.o.g. we assume $i > 1$; the case $i < -1$ follows by symmetry. Note that $i > 1$ implies $q_i, q_{i-1} \in h_t$ and thus (since t is normalized) $y_j = 1/x_j$ for $j \in \{i-1, i\}$. This yields $x_i/y_{i-1} = x_{i-1} \cdot x_i$ as well as $w_i/h_{i-1} = (x_i - x_{i-1})/(y_{i-1} - y_i) = x_{i-1} \cdot x_i$. We use these identities together with $|R_i| = w_i \cdot y_i$ to bound the formula for $|T_i|$ from [Observation 5](#):

$$\begin{aligned} |T_i| &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot (x_{i-1} + y_i) \cdot (w_i + h_{i-1}) = w_i \cdot y_i \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{x_{i-1}}{y_i}\right) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{h_{i-1}}{w_i}\right) \\ &= |R_i| \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot (1 + x_{i-1} \cdot x_i) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{x_{i-1} \cdot x_i}\right) = |R_i| \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{(1 + x_{i-1} \cdot x_i)^2}{x_{i-1} \cdot x_i} \geq 2|R_i|, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where the inequality follows since $x \mapsto (1+x)^2/x$ takes its minimum over $[0, \infty)$ at $x = 1$.

It remains to show that $|T_{-1}| + |T_1| \geq 2|R_{-1}| + 2|R_{-1}| + 2|R_0| - 2$. Note that by our definition $q_{k+1} = q_k$, if $k = 0$ we have $|R_1| = 0$ and $|T_1| = 0$. Similarly, if $l = 0$ then $|R_{-1}| = 0$

and $|T_{-1}| = 0$. We assume that not both k and l are zero, as otherwise $\xi_w(\rho_t) = \xi_w(1) = 0$ and the proposition becomes trivial. W.l.o.g. let $k > 0$; the other case follows symmetrically.

For $\alpha \in \{-1, +1\}$ (which we fix later) and $\epsilon \geq 0$ define the transformation $y_0(\epsilon) := y_0 + \alpha \cdot \epsilon \in [y_1, 1/x_0]^2$, which moves q_0 either up- or downward, depending on α . Thus, with $f(\epsilon) := |T_{-1}| + |T_1| - 2|R_{-1}| - 2|R_1| - 2|R_0| + 2$ our goal becomes to prove $f(0) \geq 0$. To this end, consider how $f(\epsilon)$ changes with ϵ . The rectangles $|R_j|$ ($j \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$) change linearly or remain constant. By [Observation 6](#), $\partial^2|T_1|/\partial\epsilon^2 = 0$. Similarly, if $l > 0$ we have $\partial^2|T_{-1}|/\partial\epsilon^2 = -\alpha^2 = -1$ by [Observation 6](#), and if $l = 0$ we have $\partial^2|T_{-1}|/\partial\epsilon^2 = 0$ (because $|T_{-1}|$ remains zero). Thus, in all cases $f''(\epsilon) \leq 0$. Then for one of the choices $\alpha \in \{-1, +1\}$ the function f must be non-increasing, meaning its minimum f_{\min} lies at one of the borders, where either $y_0 = y_1$ or $y_0 = 1/x_0$. We consider both possibilities and show that each time $f_{\min} \geq 0$ (which finishes the proof, since $f(0) \geq f_{\min} \geq 0$).

If in f_{\min} we have $y_0 = 1/x_0$, let t_{high} denote the corresponding tile. Note that q_0 lies on the hyperbola h_t . But then $|R_0| = 1$ and, thus, $f_{\min} = |T_{-1}| + |T_1| - 2|R_{-1}| - 2|R_1|$. Moreover, with $q_0 \in h_t$ we can apply the calculations for $|i| > 1$ to get $|T_{-1}| \geq 2|R_{-1}|$ and $|T_1| \geq 2|R_1|$, such that $f_{\min} \geq 0$.

So assume that in f_{\min} we have $y_0 = y_1$ and let t_{low} denote the corresponding tile. Note that R_0 and R_1 form a rectangle from the origin to the point q_1 on h_t , such that $|R_0| + |R_1| = 1$. Thus, $f_{\min} = |T_{-1}| + |T_1| - 2|R_{-1}|$. Define the (degenerate) tile t' with $\Gamma_{t'} = \{q_{-1}, q_0, q_1\}$ and anchor p , such that its crown area is $c_{t'} = |T_1| + |T_2|$. By [Lemma 12](#), for the (non-degenerate) tile \tilde{t}' with $\Gamma_{\tilde{t}'} = \Gamma_{t'} \setminus \{q_0\}$ we have $c_{\tilde{t}'} \leq c_{t'}$. The crown $c_{\tilde{t}'}$ consists of the single tower $T(q_{-1}, q_1)$. Since $q_{-1}, q_1 \in h_t$, we can apply the calculations for $|i| > 1$ to get $c_{\tilde{t}'} = |T(q_{-1}, q_1)| \geq 2|R_{-1}|$. Putting everything together we get

$$f_{\min} = |T_{-1}| + |T_1| - 2|R_{-1}| = c_{t'} - 2|R_{-1}| \geq c_{\tilde{t}'} - 2|R_{-1}| \geq 0. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

5 Strong Covering Guarantee for Greedy Tile Packings

This section proves our strong covering guarantee for TILEPACKING, namely [Theorem 1](#). We use the same approach as for our weak covering guarantee from [Section 4.2](#) but derive a stronger bound on the tiles' charging ratios. More exactly, instead of ξ_w we use

$$\xi_s: (0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \quad \xi_s(\rho) := \begin{cases} 1 - \rho \cdot (1 + \sinh(1 - 1/\rho)) & , \text{ if } \rho \leq 1/2 \\ \xi_w(\rho) = 2 \cdot (1 - \rho) & , \text{ if } \rho > 1/2. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$


Most properties required for our approach from [Section 3](#) are easily verified for ξ_s (whose function graph can be seen in [Figure 13](#) in [Appendix A](#)). Indeed, for $\rho^* := \xi_s^{-1}(3/2) \approx 0.3901$, we have $\xi'_s(\rho^*) \approx -5.1 < 0$. Moreover, ξ_s is point-convex in ρ^* , since it is convex on $(0, 1/2]$ and on $(1/2, 1]$ its tangent $t_\xi(\rho)$ in ρ^* lies below ξ_s (t_ξ is steeper and $t_\xi(1/2) \approx 0.94 < 1 = \xi_w(1/2)$). Also, by choice of ρ^* and by [Lemma 8](#), we have $\xi_s(\rho^*) = 3/2 \geq c^*$ for the total charged area c^* of a tile packing \mathcal{T} produced by TILEPACKING.

The following proposition states the remaining required property from [Section 3](#).

► **Proposition 14.** *For any tile t we have $c_t/|t| \geq \xi_s(\rho_t)$ and this bound is tight.*

With this, [Theorem 1](#) follows by applying [Lemma 4](#). The remainder of this section outlines the analysis of this proposition. Full formal statements and proofs are given in [Appendix B](#).

² These boundaries ensure that the tile remains valid and normalized. Note that if $l = 0$, moving q_0 upward also causes the dummy point q_{-1} to move upward, such that $|R_{-1}|$ and $|T_{-1}|$ remain zero.



■ **Figure 8** Low-density tile $t_h(s)$ for which ξ_s is tight.

■ **Figure 9** High-density tile $t_l(s)$ for which ξ_s is tight.

■ **Figure 10** Crown contribution of a slide.

Transformation to Worst-case Tiles. For tiles of density larger than $1/2$, [Proposition 14](#) follows from [Proposition 10](#), since in this regime $\xi_s(\rho) = \xi_w(\rho)$. The tightness for such high densities follows since for any $\rho \in (1/2, 1]$ there is a (symmetric) *step tile* $t = t_l(s)$ of size s (depicted in [Figure 9](#)) with density $\rho_t = \rho$ and $c_t/|t| = \xi_s(\rho_t)$. Thus, we restrict our further study to tiles of density at most $1/2$. We will show how to gradually transform any such tile t into a (symmetric) *hyperbola tile* $t_h(s) \preceq t$ of size s (depicted in [Figure 8](#)). Again, the tightness follows since for any $\rho \in (0, 1/2]$, we can choose s such that tile $t = t_h(s)$ has density $\rho_t = \rho$ and $c_t/|t| = \xi_s(\rho_t)$.

Before we outline the transformation process into such worst-case low-density tiles, we need to cope with the fact that $t_h(s)$ is not a staircase polygon and, thus, not captured by our tile definition. However, one can see $t_h(s)$ as the result of defining Γ_t as k equally spaced points from the hyperbola $\{(x, y) \in [0, s] \mid y = 1/x\}$ and taking the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$. The next paragraph formalizes this intuition by introducing *generalized tiles* and some related notions.

Generalized Tiles. As normal tiles, a *generalized tile* $t \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ is defined by its anchor $p \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\Gamma_t \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{U}}$ with $q \preceq p$ and $q \not\preceq q'$ for all $q \neq q'$ from Γ_t . The only difference is that Γ_t may be infinite. All other tile definitions (e.g., point set t , rectangle A_t , or density ρ_t) stay intact.

From now on the term *tile* always refers to a generalized tile. We require that the x -coordinates of Γ_t can be partitioned into k inclusion-wise maximal, closed intervals I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k , ordered by increasing x -coordinates. For $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ let $q_i^-, q_i^+ \in \Gamma_t$ denote the points realizing the left- and rightmost x -coordinate of I_i , respectively. Note that I_i may be a point interval, such that $q_i^- = q_i^+$. A *section* of Γ_t is a tuple as follows:

- a *step* (q_i^+, q_{i+1}^-) , if $q_i^+, q_{i+1}^- \in h_t$;
- a *slide* (q_i^-, q_i^+) , if $q_i^- \neq q_i^+$ and $\{q \in \Gamma_t \mid x(q) \in I_i\} \subseteq h_t$;
- a *double step* $(q_{i-1}^+, q_i^-, q_{i+1}^-)$, if $q_{i-1}^+, q_{i+1}^- \in h_t$ and $q_i^- = q_i^+ \notin h_t$; or
- the *corners* (q_1, q_2) , if $q_1 \notin h_t$ and $q_2 \in h_t$ as well as (q_{k-1}, q_k) if $q_k \notin h_t$ and $q_{k-1} \in h_t$.

After applying [Lemma 13](#), all tiles resulting from our transformations can be described as a sequence of such sections. [Figure 14](#) illustrates generalized tiles and the different sections.

Crown Contribution of Slides. Our charging scheme from [Section 4.1](#) generalizes naturally to slides by considering them as the limit of $k \rightarrow \infty$ equally spaced upper staircase points. This yields the following complement to [Observation 5](#).

► **Observation 15.** For a tile t , the contribution of a slide (q_1, q_2) to the crown C_t is $H(q_1, q_2) := [\ln(z) + 1/4 \cdot (z^2 - z^{-2})]_{x_1}^{x_2}$.

Proof. Rotate the hyperbola by $\pi/4$ around the bottom-left corner of t , to obtain the rotated hyperbola $h_r(x) = \sqrt{x^2 + 2}$. The contribution can then be calculated by integration: The indefinite integral under $h_r(x)$ is $H_r(x) := \int h_r(x)dx = x/2 \cdot \sqrt{2 + x^2} + \operatorname{arsinh}(x/\sqrt{2})$, and for $x = (z - 1/z)/\sqrt{2}$, we get $H_r((z - 1/z)/\sqrt{2}) = \ln(z) + 1/4 \cdot (z^2 - z^{-2})$ (see Figure 10). ◀

Overview of the Transformation Process. Figure 12 gives an overview of how we gradually transform an arbitrary tile t with density $\rho_t \leq 1/2$ into a worst-case hyperbola tile $t_h(s)$. Starting with an arbitrary tile t (I), Lemma 23 either enforces $\Gamma_t \subseteq h_t$ or exactly one $q \notin h_t$, can be forced to be in a double-step (q_1, q, q_2) with $x(q_1) \leq 1 \leq x(q_2)$ (II), or to be in corner (q, q') with $x(q') \geq 1$ or corner (q', q) with $x(q') \leq 1$ (III).

The next transformation from (II)/(III) to (IV)/(V) is based on smaller modifications (Lemmas 20 to 22) which are combined in Lemma 24 to eliminate all but one step (while increasing, e.g., slides). Lemma 20 “squeezes” the tile to broaden very thin left- or rightmost steps (q, q') . Lemma 21 moves steps with an adjacent slide along the hyperbola towards either the left or bottom of the tile, whichever is nearer. Lemma 22 transforms two consecutive steps left of $(1, 1)$ into a step and a slide (or symmetrical on the right side of $(1, 1)$).

After we are down to only one step, Lemmas 25 and 26 show for (IV) and (V), respectively, that either $\Gamma_t \subseteq h_t$ or t contains no slides which (together with Lemma 27) reduces the remaining cases to those illustrated in (VI) to (IX). For each of these we separately show $t_h(s) \preceq t$ (Lemmas 28 and 30 to 32), proving Proposition 14.

6 Upper Bound

To show Theorem 2, we construct a point set where TILEPACKING fails to cover an area larger than roughly $(1 - e^{-2})/2$. Our goal is to construct a tile \hat{t} at the origin where each maximal rectangle has the same size A . We therefore place a large number of k points q_i densely on a hyperbola h_A centered in the origin. The remaining tiles are constructed such that they have a density close to $1/2$. To this end we add for each point q_i on h_A a set of (almost) evenly spaced points $p_{i,j}$ with distance roughly ε between each other, see Figure 11.

To get a density close to $1/2$, the exact coordinates of the points $p_{i,j}$ must be chosen carefully: we place the points on arcs of functions f_i described by differential equations, where each f_i depends on the two neighboring curves f_{i-1} and f_{i+1} . Formal definitions of the point set $P_{\varepsilon,k}$ and the functions f_i are given in Appendix C.

We now sketch the proof of Theorem 2. For simplicity, assume that TILEPACKING on $P_{\varepsilon,k}$ covers half of $\hat{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{U} \setminus \hat{t}$ and an area of A of \hat{t} . Both assumptions introduce an error; in Appendix C we show that both error terms vanish as k goes to infinity and ε goes to zero. In the full proof, we first show that the f_i are well-behaved: their arcs do not intersect each other, and they only intersect h_A at q_i . This allow us to show the aforementioned density close to $1/2$ for all tiles $\neq \hat{t}$ (unless they are too close to $(1, 1)$, in which case they have negligible area.) The upper bound then follows by optimizing the parameter A .

Proof Sketch for Theorem 2. We analyze the area ρ covered by TILEPACKING on $P_{\varepsilon,k}$. Let $\hat{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{U} \setminus \hat{t}$. Assume that TILEPACKING covers half of $\hat{\mathcal{U}}$ and an area of A of \hat{t} . Then $\rho \leq A + |\hat{\mathcal{U}}|/2 = A + (1 - |\hat{t}|)/2 \leq A + (1 - (A + \int_A^1 A/x \, dx))/2 = (1 + A + A \ln A)/2$. Minimizing this term leads to $\rho = (1 - e^{-2})/2$ at $A = e^{-2}$. ◀





Figure 11 Our construction.

References

- 1 A. Adamaszek and A. Wiese. Approximation Schemes for Maximum Weight Independent Set of Rectangles. In *54th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2013, 26-29 October, 2013, Berkeley, CA, USA*, pages 400–409. IEEE Computer Society, 2013. doi: [10.1109/FOCS.2013.50](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2013.50).
- 2 A. Adamaszek and A. Wiese. A quasi-PTAS for the Two-Dimensional Geometric Knapsack Problem. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, January 4-6, 2015*, pages 1491–1505. SIAM, 2015. doi: [10.1137/1.9781611973730.98](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611973730.98).
- 3 A. Adamaszek, P. Chalermsook, and A. Wiese. How to Tame Rectangles: Solving Independent Set and Coloring of Rectangles via Shrinking. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques, APPROX/RANDOM 2015, August 24-26, 2015, Princeton, NJ, USA*, volume 40 of *LIPICs*, pages 43–60. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2015. doi: [10.4230/LIPICs.APPROX-RANDOM.2015.43](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.APPROX-RANDOM.2015.43).
- 4 H. A. Akitaya, M. D. Jones, D. Stalf, and C. D. Tóth. Maximum Area Axis-Aligned Square Packings. In *43rd International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS 2018, August 27-31, 2018, Liverpool, UK*, volume 117 of *LIPICs*, pages 77:1–77:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018. doi: [10.4230/LIPICs.MFCS.2018.77](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.MFCS.2018.77).
- 5 A. Antoniadis, F. Biermeier, A. Cristi, C. Damerius, R. Hoeksma, D. Kaaser, P. Kling, and L. Nölke. On the Complexity of Anchored Rectangle Packing. In *27th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2019, September 9-11, 2019, Munich/Garching, Germany*, volume 144 of *LIPICs*, pages 8:1–8:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019. doi: [10.4230/LIPICs.ESA.2019.8](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ESA.2019.8).
- 6 K. Balas and C. D. Tóth. On the number of anchored rectangle packings for a planar point set. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 654:143–154, 2016. doi: [10.1016/j.tcs.2016.03.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2016.03.007).
- 7 K. Balas, A. Dumitrescu, and C. D. Tóth. Anchored rectangle and square packings. *Discret. Optim.*, 26:131–162, 2017. doi: [10.1016/j.disopt.2017.08.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disopt.2017.08.003).
- 8 V. Bian. Special Configurations in Anchored Rectangle Packings, 2018.
- 9 T. C. Biedl, A. Bini, A. Maheshwari, and S. Mehrabi. Packing boundary-anchored rectangles and squares. *Comput. Geom.*, 88:101610, 2020. doi: [10.1016/j.comgeo.2020.101610](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comgeo.2020.101610).
- 10 T. M. Chan and S. Har-Peled. Approximation Algorithms for Maximum Independent Set of Pseudo-Disks. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 48(2):373–392, 2012. doi: [10.1007/s00454-012-9417-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00454-012-9417-5).
- 11 A. Dumitrescu and C. D. Tóth. Packing anchored rectangles. *Comb.*, 35(1):39–61, 2015. doi: [10.1007/s00493-015-3006-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00493-015-3006-1).
- 12 R. Hoeksma and M. Maat. A better lower bound for Lower-Left Anchored Rectangle Packing. *CoRR*, abs/2102.05747, 2021. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.05747>.
- 13 IBM. Ponder This Challenge: Puzzle for June 2004, 2004. <https://www.research.ibm.com/haifa/ponderthis/challenges/June2004.html>.
- 14 K. Jansen and M. Rau. Improved approximation for two dimensional Strip Packing with polynomial bounded width. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 789:34–49, 2019. doi: [10.1016/j.tcs.2019.04.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2019.04.002).
- 15 K. G. Kakoulis and I. G. Tollis. Labeling Algorithms. In R. Tamassia, editor, *Handbook on Graph Drawing and Visualization*, pages 489–515. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2013.
- 16 A. I. Merino and A. Wiese. On the Two-Dimensional Knapsack Problem for Convex Polygons. In *47th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*,

ICALP 2020, July 8-11, 2020, Saarbrücken, Germany (Virtual Conference), volume 168 of *LIPICs*, pages 84:1–84:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020. doi: [10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2020.84](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2020.84).

- 17 W. T. Tutte, editor. *Recent Progress in Combinatorics: Proceedings of the 3rd Waterloo Conference on Combinatorics*, 1969. Academic Press.
- 18 P. Winkler. Packing Rectangles. *Mathematical Mind-Benders*, pages 133–134, 2007.
- 19 P. Winkler. Puzzled: Solutions and Sources. *Commun. ACM*, 53(9):110, Sept. 2010. ISSN 0001-0782. doi: [10.1145/1810891.1810917](https://doi.org/10.1145/1810891.1810917).
- 20 P. Winkler. Puzzled: Rectangles Galore. *Commun. ACM*, 53(11):112, Nov. 2010. ISSN 0001-0782. doi: [10.1145/1839676.1839700](https://doi.org/10.1145/1839676.1839700).



■ **Figure 12** Transforming low-density tiles t with $\rho_t \leq 1/2$ to a corresponding worst-case hyperbola tile $t_h(s) \preceq t$. For the normalized tiles in Cases (II) and later, the blue dot marks the point $(1, 1)$.

A Auxiliary Notions and Results

The next lemma proves that when analyzing algorithm TILEPACKING we can, w.l.o.g., restrict ourselves to input point sets P that are in general position.

► **Lemma 16.** *TILEPACKING achieves the same bound on point sets in general position as for arbitrary point sets.*


Proof. Assume that TILEPACKING chooses the points in some order p_1, \dots, p_n while producing a tile packing \mathcal{T} . Move all points except $p_n = (0, 0)$ to the top right by at most some small $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the processing order by TILEPACKING stays the same and the point set is in general position. TILEPACKING will produce a new tile packing \mathcal{T}' . The upper staircase points of each tile t move by at most ε in either direction and thus A_t may increase by at most $O(\varepsilon)$. Hence $A(\mathcal{T}') \leq A(\mathcal{T}) + |P| O(\varepsilon)$, which proves the statement for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. ◀

The following definition captures a “local” version of convexity. We use in Section 3 to derive a lower bound on the area covered by a tile packing.


► **Definition 17.** A function $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *point-convex* in $x \in I$ if f is differentiable in x and the tangent t of f in x satisfies $t(x) \leq f(x)$ for all $x \in I$.

An immediate consequence of Definition 17 is that Jensen’s inequality holds for f in x . That is, if f is point-convex in x and $x = \sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i \cdot x_i$ is a convex combination of $x_i \in I$ (i.e., $\gamma_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i = 1$), then

$$f(x) = t(x) = \sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i \cdot t(x_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i \cdot f(x_i). \tag{7}$$



■ **Figure 13** The plot shows our strong lower bound function ξ_s from Section 5. The green line is its tangent t_ξ in $\rho^* = \xi_s^{-1}(3/2)$. Note that this illustrates that ξ_s is point-convex in ρ^* .



■ **Figure 14** A generalized tile with four sections formed by the five intervals I_1 to I_5 (of which only I_4 is a proper interval). They form a step (between I_1 and I_2), a double-step (between I_2 and I_4), a slide (I_4), and a corner (I_4, I_5).

B Details for the Improved Bound

In this section we show the omitted details for the strong covering guarantee of [Section 5](#). Note that we will use $[F(x)]_a^b := F(b) - F(a)$ as a shorthand notation. Additionally we will use $\vec{x} \rightarrow \vec{x}'$ as a notation for substituting \vec{x} with \vec{x}' . Due to [Lemma 13](#) we will always assume that t satisfies $|\Gamma_t \setminus h_t| \leq 1$.

► **Remark 18.** All transformation Lemmas obviously hold up to mirroring at the $(x = y)$ -axis.

► **Observation 19.** In the following we will make often use of very similar arguments to rule out specific structures of tiles. For this argument we define the area $|t(\vec{x})|$ and crown $C(\vec{x})$ of a tile as a function of some (general) parameters. Usually these will be the $x_i = x(q_i) \in \Gamma_t$, but we leave them as general parameters for now. We then introduce a transformation on these parameters, i.e., $\vec{x}(\varepsilon)$ with $\vec{x}(0) = \vec{x}$ as well as defining $\vec{X} = \vec{x}'|_{\varepsilon=0}$ and $\vec{Y} = \vec{x}''|_{\varepsilon=0}$. As our transformation needs to leave the area invariant we will enforce that $|t(\vec{x}(\varepsilon))| = |t(\vec{x})|$ for all ε .

$$\text{We then obtain that } \partial_\varepsilon \frac{C(\vec{x}(\varepsilon))}{|t(\vec{x}(\varepsilon))|} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = \frac{\partial_\varepsilon C(\vec{x}(\varepsilon))|_{\varepsilon=0}}{|t(\vec{x})|} = \frac{\vec{X} \vec{\nabla} C(\vec{x})}{|t(\vec{x})|}$$

Assuming that all parameters can be increased or decreased, the only way we cannot improve the ratio with a transformation is when:

$$\vec{X} \vec{\nabla} C(\vec{x}) = 0 \tag{8}$$

As it is still possible that our transformation is in a local maximum of, we therefore also analyze the second derivative:

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_\varepsilon^2 \frac{C(\vec{x}(\varepsilon))}{|t(\vec{x}(\varepsilon))|} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\ &= \frac{\partial_\varepsilon^2 C(\vec{x}(\varepsilon))|_{\varepsilon=0}}{|t(\vec{x})|} \\ &= \frac{\partial_\varepsilon x'_j(\varepsilon) C_j(\vec{x}(\varepsilon))}{|t(\vec{x})|} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\ &= \frac{x''_j(\varepsilon) C_j(\vec{x}(\varepsilon)) + x'_j(\varepsilon) x'_k(\varepsilon) C_{jk}(\vec{x}(\varepsilon))}{|t(\vec{x})|} \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = \frac{\vec{Y} \vec{\nabla} C(\vec{x}) + \vec{X} H_C \vec{X}}{|t(\vec{x})|} \end{aligned}$$

Where C_j is shorthand for $\partial_{x_j} C(x_i)$ and H_C is the Hessian of $C(x_i)$. Thus, we have a local minimum and can thus not improve the ratio, as long as:

$$\vec{Y} \vec{\nabla} C(\vec{x}) + \vec{X} H_C \vec{X} \geq 0 \tag{9}$$

Note that as long as $|t(x_i(\varepsilon))| = |t(x_i)|$ holds, the only needed information of the transformation is \vec{X}, \vec{Y} . As we have shown, the above equations holding is necessary, as otherwise a transformation could improve the tile. Another possibility is, that the transformation itself is not possible as an involved parameter is on a boundary and cannot be moved further. We thus can use these equations not holding for specific transformations to follow that these parameters have to be on a boundary and thus rule out specific tile structures.

► **Lemma 20.** *Let t be a tile with the leftmost sections being up to one step followed by up to one slide. Then these sections can be replaced by up to one step $s = (q_1, q_2)$ and up to one slide $h = (q_2, q_3)$ such that*

1. *If s exists, then $x_1 x_2 \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$*

2. If h exists, then $x_1x_2 \leq 1/\sqrt{2}$

giving us a tile $\tilde{t} \preceq t$.

Proof. We assume that both leftmost sections, i.e., a step $s = (q_1, q_2)$, followed by a slide $h = (q_2, q_3)$ exist. The other cases can be treated similarly.

We analyze how $|t|$ and $|C_t|$ change as we move q_1 and q_2 along h_t . To obtain $\tilde{t} \preceq t$, we must have $|\tilde{t}| = |t|$. This is satisfied if $1 + (x_2 - x_1)/x_2 + \ln(x_3/x_2)$ is left constant. Using the substitution $x_1 = -x_2(\alpha + \ln(x_2))$, this term becomes $2 + \alpha + \ln(x_3)$, which is independent of x_2 .

As we also require that the crown gets smaller, we analyze the contribution C of both sections to the crown of t . For $D = 1 + \alpha + \ln(x_3) + \frac{1}{4}(x_3^2 - x_3^{-2})$:

$$\begin{aligned} C &= |T(q_1, q_2)| + H(q_2, q_3) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{x_1} - \frac{1}{x_2} + x_2 - x_1 \right) \left(x_1 + \frac{1}{x_2} \right) + \left[\ln(z) + \frac{1}{4}(z^2 - z^{-2}) \right]_{x_2}^{x_3} \\ &= D - \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1 + 2(\alpha + \ln(x_2))^{-1}}{x_2^2} + (1 + 2\alpha(1 + \alpha) + 2\ln(x_2)(1 + 2\alpha + \ln(x_2)))x_2^2 \right) \\ \frac{\partial C}{\partial x_2} &= \frac{(1 + \alpha + \ln(x_2))^2 ((\alpha + \ln(x_2))^{-2} - 2x_2^4)}{2x_2^3} \\ &= \frac{(x_2 - x_1)^2 (1 - 2x_1^2 x_2^2)}{2x_1^2 x_2^3} \end{aligned}$$


(Note that the area is only dependent on α and x_3 and not x_2 , so differentiation w.r.t. x_2 is justified.) The last term is positive iff $x_1x_2 < 1/\sqrt{2}$. In this case we can decrease x_2 until either $x_1x_2 = 1/\sqrt{2}$ or the step was completely removed. Similarly, if $x_1x_2 > 1/\sqrt{2}$, we can increase x_2 until either $x_1x_2 = 1/\sqrt{2}$ or the slide was completely removed. In both cases, the statement easily follows. \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 21.** *Let t be a tile with a step (q_1, q_2) and a slide (q_2, q_3) . If $x_1 \geq 1/x_3$, then the two sections can be replaced by a slide (q_1, q_4) and a step (q_4, q_2) , resulting in a tile $\tilde{t} \preceq t$.*

Proof. To obtain $\tilde{t} \preceq t$, the tile has to keep its area upon replacing the sections, so $(x_2 - x_1)/x_2 + \ln(x_3/x_2) = \ln(x_4/x_1) + (x_3 - x_4)/x_3$. This is fulfilled if we set $x_4 = \frac{x_1x_3}{x_2}$.

Let C be the contribution of both sections to C_t and \tilde{C} be the contribution of both sections to $C_{\tilde{t}}$. We are interested in the difference Δ between both:

$$\begin{aligned} C &= |T(q_1, q_2)| + H(q_2, q_3) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{x_1} - \frac{1}{x_2} + x_2 - x_1 \right) \left(x_1 + \frac{1}{x_2} \right) + \left[\ln(z) + \frac{1}{4}(z^2 - z^{-2}) \right]_{x_2}^{x_3} \\ \tilde{C} &= H(q_1, q_4) + T(q_4, q_3) \\ &= \left[\ln(z) + \frac{1}{4}(z^2 - z^{-2}) \right]_{x_1}^{x_4} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{x_4} - \frac{1}{x_3} + x_3 - x_4 \right) \left(x_4 + \frac{1}{x_3} \right) \\ &= \left[\ln(z) + \frac{1}{4}(z^2 - z^{-2}) \right]_{x_1}^{\frac{x_1x_3}{x_2}} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{x_2}{x_1x_3} - \frac{1}{x_3} + x_3 - \frac{x_1x_3}{x_2} \right) \left(\frac{x_1x_3}{x_2} + \frac{1}{x_3} \right) \\ \Delta &= \tilde{C} - C \\ &= \frac{(x_2 - x_1)^2 (x_3^2 - x_2^2) (1 - x_1^2 x_3^2)}{4x_1^2 x_2^2 x_3^2} \end{aligned}$$



■ **Figure 15** Merging two steps in [Lemma 22](#).

$$\leq \frac{(x_2 - x_1)^2(x_3^2 - x_2^2)(1 - \frac{1}{x_3^2}x_2^2)}{4x_1^2x_2^2x_3^2} = 0$$

This immediately gives us a new tile $\tilde{t} \preceq t$. ◀

► **Lemma 22.** *Let t be a tile and $(q_1, q_2), (q_2, q_3)$ be steps with $x_3 \leq 1$. Then the two steps can be replaced with a step (q_1, q_3) and a slide (q_3, q_4) resulting in a tile $\tilde{t} \preceq t$.*

Proof. See [Figure 15](#) for a depiction. We will look at a generalized tile t' with two steps (q_1, q_2) , (q_2, q_3) and a slide (q_3, q_4) . t can be understood as having $q_3 = q_4$, such that the slide vanishes, and \tilde{t} corresponds to $q_2 = q_3$. We will move q_3 to the left on the hyperbola and let q_2 move such that the transformation is area-preserving. t' is then obtained when both points coincide. Therefore we show $\partial|C_{t'}|/\partial x_3 \geq 0$ while letting $x_2 := f(x_3)$ for area preservation. We first look at a part u of the tile area which has to stay constant. This then also implies a formula for the derivative of $x_2 = f(x_3)$ w.r.t. x_3 :

$$\begin{aligned} u &:= 1 + (x_2 - x_1)/x_2 + (x_3 - x_2)/x_3 + \ln(x_4/x_3) \\ &= 1 + (f(x_3) - x_1)/f(x_3) + (x_3 - f(x_3))/x_3 + \ln(x_4/x_3) \\ \frac{\partial f(x_3)}{\partial x_3} &= \frac{f(x_3)^2(x_3 - f(x_3))}{x_3(x_1x_3 - f(x_3)^2)} \\ &= \frac{x_2^2(x_3 - x_2)}{x_3(x_1x_3 - x_2^2)} \end{aligned}$$

Solving the above area equality for x_2 we obtain the two solutions

$$x_2^\pm = \frac{1}{2}(y \pm \sqrt{y^2 - 4x_1x_3})$$

where $y = (3 - u + \ln(x_4/x_3))x_3$. Note that at least one of the solutions must be real, so $y^2 > 4x_1x_3$ has to hold. We will show that $x_2 = x_2^+$ always yields a smaller crown area. To see this, look at the difference Δ of the contribution C of the sections to the crown area:

$$\begin{aligned} C &= |T(q_1, q_2)| + |T(q_2, q_3)| + H(q_3, q_4) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{x_1} - \frac{1}{x_2} + x_2 - x_1 \right) \left(x_1 + \frac{1}{x_2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{x_2} - \frac{1}{x_3} + x_3 - x_2 \right) \left(x_2 + \frac{1}{x_3} \right) + \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\ln z + \frac{1}{4}(z^2 + z^{-2}) \right]_{x_3}^{x_4} \\
\Delta &= C|_{x_2=x_2^+} - C|_{x_2=x_2^-} \\
&= \frac{(1 - x_1^2 x_3^2) \sqrt{y^2 - 4x_1 x_3} (y - x_1 - x_3)}{2x_1^2 x_3^2} \\
&= \frac{(1 - x_1^2 x_3^2) \sqrt{y^2 - 4x_1 x_3} (x_2 - x_1)(x_3 - x_2) / (-x_2)}{2x_1^2 x_3^2} \\
&\leq 0
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is true due to $0 < x_1 < x_2 < x_3 \leq 1$.

Using $\partial f(x_3) / \partial x_3$ from above, we get for $C := C|_{x_2=f(x_3)}$:

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial x_3} = \frac{(x_3 - x_2)X}{2x_1 x_2 x_3^3 (x_2^2 - x_1 x_3)}$$

where $X = x_2 x_3^2 + x_1^2 x_3 (1 - x_2^3 x_3 + x_2 x_3^3) + x_1 (x_2 x_3 - x_2^2 + 2(x_2^4 - 1)x_3^2 - 2x_2^3 x_3^3)$. The term $(x_3 - x_2) / (2x_1 x_2 x_3^3 (x_2^2 - x_1 x_3))$ is positive since $x_2 = (y + \sqrt{y^2 - 4x_1 x_3}) / 2 \geq y/2 \geq \sqrt{x_1 x_3}$, so it only remains to show $X \geq 0$. We apply the substitution $x_1 = \alpha \beta^2 x_3$ and $x_2 = \beta x_3$. The constraints $0 < x_1 < x_2 < x_3 \leq 1, x_2 \geq \sqrt{x_1 x_3}$ then rearrange into $0 < \alpha, \beta, x_3 \leq 1$ and we get for X :

$$\begin{aligned}
X &= 1 - \alpha \beta (2 - \beta + (1 - \alpha) \beta^2) - \alpha (1 - \beta) (2 - \alpha - \alpha \beta) \beta^4 x_3^4 \\
&\geq 1 - \alpha \beta (2 - \beta + (1 - \alpha) \beta^2) - \alpha (1 - \beta) (2 - \alpha - \alpha \beta) \\
&= (1 - \alpha) (1 - \alpha (1 - (1 - \beta) \beta^2)) \\
&\geq (1 - \alpha)^2 \\
&\geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the statement. \blacktriangleleft

► Lemma 23. *Let t be a tile. Then either there exists a tile $\tilde{t} \preceq t$ with $\Gamma_{\tilde{t}} \subset h_{\tilde{t}}$, or t contains a double step (q_1, q_2) with $x_1 \leq 1 \leq x_2$ or a corner (q_1, q_2) with $x_1 < 1$ (if $q_2 \notin h_t, x_2 > 1$ if $q_1 \notin h_t$).*

Proof. By assumption we only have at most one point $q \in \Gamma_t$ which lies not on the hyperbola. If there is no such point, then we are done, as such we assume this point exists.

First consider the case where q is part of a corner. (w.l.o.g. we assume it to be of the form (q, q_1) , where $q \notin h_t$. We then have $x_1 < 1$). The crown associated to q is then $C_q = \frac{1}{2}(x + \frac{1}{x_1})(y - \frac{1}{x_1} + x_1 - x)$. We will move q to the top left or bottom right such that the tile area does not change. This transformation is $x \rightarrow x + \frac{x(x_1 y - 1)}{x_1(y + \varepsilon) - 1}, y \rightarrow y + \varepsilon$, which as can be easily checked leaves the tile area invariant. Using [Observation 19](#) this leads to [Equation \(9\)](#): $x_1^2 - 3x x_1 - 1 \geq 0$, which is easily checked to be false since $0 < x < x_1 < 1$ holds.

As such the minimal crown must be on the boundary of the transformation, i.e., where q is on the hyperbola.

Now assume that q is part of the double step (q_1, q, q_2) . We denote $h_1 = \frac{1}{x_1} - y, w_1 = x - x_1, h_2 = y - \frac{1}{x_2}, w_2 = x_2 - x$. W.l.o.g. assume that $x_2 < 1$, we then denote by q_0 and q_1 the two leftmost points. As $q_0 \in h_t$, we get that the crown associated with these two points is $C = \frac{1}{2}(x_1 - x_0 + y_0 - y_1)(x_0 + y_1)$. It is easy to check that moving q_0 down decreases the

crown as well as $|t|$ s such, we are only interested in cases where $h_1 > h_2$ and $w_2 > w_1$, as otherwise it is easy to see that we can move q up or right, respectively. This decreases $|C_t|$ while increasing $|t|$. Together with moving q_0 down, we can thus reduce C_t further while leaving $|t|$ invariant until either q_0 degenerates, or q reaches the hyperbola. At the end this yields a corner, which we have already dealt with.

For the remaining cases we move q such that the tile area remains the same, so $w_1 h_2 = (w_1 + \varepsilon)(h_2 + \delta)$ (with one of ε, δ being negative), or equally $\delta = w_1 h_2 / (w_1 + \varepsilon) - h_2$. We thus obtain the transformation $h_1 \rightarrow h_1 - \delta$, $w_1 \rightarrow w_1 + \varepsilon$, $h_2 \rightarrow h_2 + \delta$, $w_2 \rightarrow w_2 - \varepsilon$.

The crown is then given by:

$$C(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2}(h_1 + w_1)(x_1 + 1/x_1 - h_1) + \frac{1}{2}(h_2 + w_2)(x_1 + w_1 + 1/x_1 - h_1 - h_2)$$

For the derivatives w.r.t. ε at $\varepsilon = 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{\partial C(\varepsilon)}{\partial \varepsilon} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{h_2(h_2 - h_1)}{w_1} - w_1 + w_2 \right) \\ \left. \frac{\partial^2 C(\varepsilon)}{\partial \varepsilon^2} \right|_{\varepsilon=0} &= \frac{(h_1 - 2h_2)h_2}{w_1^2} - 1 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can now conclude $h_2 < w_2$, as otherwise we get for the first derivative $\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{h_2(h_2 - h_1)}{w_1} - w_1 + w_2 \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(w_2 - w_1 - \frac{h_2^2}{w_1} \right) < 0$ since $w_2 \leq h_2$ and $w_1 < w_2 \leq h_2$. As we thus find a direction in which our transformation lowers the crown area.

Additionally, if the second derivative is negative, $C(\varepsilon)$ has no minimum and thus the minimum has to be on the boundary. So it remains to handle the case where $(h_1 - 2h_2)h_2 \geq w_1^2$, $h_1 > h_2$, $w_2 > w_1$ and $w_2 > h_2$. We move q to its new location $q' = (x_2 - (h_2 - \gamma), y_2 + (h_2 - \gamma))$. Since $x_2 < 1$, q' remains below the hyperbola. γ can be chosen such that $A = B$: For $\gamma = 0$, we have $A = 0 < (w_2 - h_2)h_2 = B$ and for $\gamma = h_2$ we have $A = w_1 h_2 > 0 = B$. Since A and B change continuously while we change γ in $[0, h_2]$, there must be some γ where $A = B$ and therefore $\gamma w_1 = (h_2 - \gamma)(w_2 - (h_2 - \gamma))$. Note that $w'_2 > w'_1$ reduces to $\gamma < h_2 - \frac{w_1}{2} - \frac{w_2}{2}$, which can be easily checked to be false. As such the resulting tile can be dealt with by the above method, and it remains to show that crown area is reduced:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= \frac{1}{2}(h'_1 + w'_1)(x_1 + 1/x_1 - h'_1) + \frac{1}{2}(h'_2 + w'_2)(x_1 + w'_1 + 1/x_1 - h'_1 - h'_2) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}(h_1 + w_1)(x_1 + 1/x_1 - h_1) - \frac{1}{2}(h_2 + w_2)(x_1 + w_1 + 1/x_1 - h_1 - h_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(h_1 - w_1 + 3h_2)(h_2 - w_2) + (-h_1 + w_1 - 3h_2 + w_2)\gamma + \gamma^2 \end{aligned}$$

It is easily seen that $\partial \Delta / \partial h_1 < 0$ holds, as γ is independent of h_1 . As we want to show $\Delta < 0$ we thus can assume h_1 to be minimal, i.e., $h_1 = w_1^2 / h_2 + 2h_2$. We thus obtain:

$$\Delta \leq \frac{(w_1^2 - w_1 h_2 + 5h_2^2)(h_2 - w_2)}{2h_2} + w_1 \gamma - \frac{w_1^2 \gamma}{h_2} + (-5h_2 + w_2)\gamma + \gamma^2$$

It is more involved but still straightforward to check that the derivative of this term with respect to w_2 is also negative. (Note that γ is dependent on w_2). Thus choosing w_2 minimal, i.e., $w_2 = h_2$ we obtain:

$$\Delta \leq \gamma \left(w_1 - \frac{w_1^2}{h_2} - 4h_2 + \gamma \right) \leq 0$$

where the last inequality follows from $w_1 \leq w_2 = h_2$ and $0 < \gamma < h_2$. With this we can always find \tilde{t} with the required properties. \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 24.** *Consider a tile t with $\rho_t \leq 1/2$. Then there exists a tile $\tilde{t} \preceq t$, containing at most one step. Furthermore, if $\Gamma_t \subseteq h_t$ then $\Gamma_{\tilde{t}} \subseteq h_{\tilde{t}}$.*

Proof. If t only contains one step we are already done. Otherwise, we denote by $s = (q_1, q_2)$ and $s' = (q_3, q_4)$ the leftmost and rightmost step respectively. Assume that no transformations are available from [Lemma 22](#), [Lemma 21](#) and [Lemma 23](#). We show that $\rho_t > 1/2$ with a contradiction.

Assume that $q_2 \neq q_3$, then at least one section has to exist between s and s' . If we assume $1 < x_1 < x_2 < x_3 < x_4$ (or its mirror), [Lemma 22](#) and [Lemma 21](#) rule out a step or slide, and [Lemma 23](#) exclude a corner/double-step. As such we can assume that $x_1 < 1 < x_4$. We then differentiate between the cases $x_1 < 1 < x_2$ (or equivalently its mirror) and $x_2 \leq 1 \leq x_3$. In the first case, there can only be one slide between s and s' . In both cases attaching a slide before s or after s' is impossible: Either we get a slide-step-slide sequence, which is impossible by [Lemma 21](#), or we get a step-slide sequence, which is impossible by [Lemma 21](#). As such s' and s are both boundary steps. Since [Lemma 20](#) was inapplicable, we get that $x_1 x_2 \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$ and $y_3 y_4 \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$. From $x_1 < x_2$ and $y_4 < y_3$ we then get $1/\sqrt{2} < x_2^2$ and $1/\sqrt{2} < y_3^2$. With this we bound $|t|$ from above:

$$\begin{aligned} |t| &\leq 1 + (x_2 - x_1)/x_2 + \ln(x_3/x_2) + (x_4 - x_3)/x_4 \\ &= 3 - x_1/x_2 - \ln(y_3 x_2) - y_4/y_3 \\ &\leq 3 - (x_2^{-2}/\sqrt{2} + \ln x_2) - (y_3^{-2}/\sqrt{2} + \ln y_3) \end{aligned}$$

The term $z^{-2}/\sqrt{2} + \ln z$ is minimized at $z = \sqrt[4]{2}$ with value $(2 + \ln 2)/4$. We conclude $\rho_t = 1/|t| \geq 1/(3 - 2(2 + \ln 2)/4) \approx 0.6 > 1/2$.

Instead suppose $q_2 = q_3$. We get again that $x_1 < 1 < x_4$ by [Lemma 22](#). This means that [Lemma 23](#) does not allow the existence of a corner/double-step. So s, s' are the outermost steps, and only slides can exist beside s and s' . If no slide exists, we end up in the case above. By symmetry we can w.l.o.g. choose $x_1 < 1 \leq x_2$, which means that [Lemma 21](#) does not permit a slide after s' . Therefore a slide $h = (q_0, q_1)$ exists. By [Lemma 21](#) we know that $x_0 > 1/x_2$. Since s' is a boundary step, [Lemma 20](#) gives us $1/(x_2 x_4) \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$. The total area of $|t|$ is then:

$$\begin{aligned} |t| &= 1 + \ln(x_1/x_0) + (x_2 - x_1)/x_2 + (x_4 - x_2)/x_4 \\ &= 3 - x_1/x_2 - x_2/x_4 + \ln(x_1/x_0) \\ &\leq 3 - x_1/x_2 - x_2^2/\sqrt{2} + \ln(x_2 x_1) \\ &\leq 3 - 1/x_2 - x_2^2/\sqrt{2} + \ln(x_2) \leq 1.4 \end{aligned}$$

where the second to last inequality follows from the derivative w.r.t. x_1 being $1/x_1 - 1/x_2 > 0$, so x_1 was maximized. We conclude $\rho_t = 1/|t| > 1/2$.

Therefore we conclude that we can use transformations of [Lemma 22](#), [Lemma 21](#) and [Lemma 23](#) to reduce the step count to ≤ 1 . As none of these transformations moves points in Γ_t away from the hyperbola, this gives the second property. This gives us the required tile $\tilde{t} \preceq t$. ◀

► **Lemma 25.** *Let t be a tile with a double step (q_1, q_2, q_3) and a slide (q_3, q_4) . We can replace both sections by a double step (q_1, q_4) or a sequence of steps and slides between q_1 and q_4 , obtaining a tile $t' \preceq t$.*

Proof. We have that $|t_R(\vec{q})| = 1 + (x_2 - x_1)y_2 + (x_3 - x_2)/x_3 + \log(x_4/x_3)$ and $C_{t_R}(\vec{q}) = T(q_1, q_2) + T(q_2, q_3) + H(q_3, q_4) = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{x_1} - x_1 + x_2 - y_2)(x_1 + y_2) + \frac{1}{2}(x_2 + \frac{1}{x_3})(-x_2 - \frac{1}{x_3} +$

$x_3 + y_2) + \frac{1}{4}(-\frac{1}{x_4} + x_4^2 + \frac{1}{x_3^2} - x_3^2 + 4 \log(\frac{x_4}{x_3}))$. Where t_R is the part of the tile consisting of the double step/slide. We will transform the tile by moving q_2 up/down while moving q_3 on the hyperbola to leave the tile area invariant. We define this transformation by $(y_2 \rightarrow y_2 + \varepsilon, x_3 \rightarrow -x_2/W(-\frac{e^{-x_2/x_3+x_1\varepsilon-x_2\varepsilon}x_2}{x_3}))$, where W denotes the main branch of the product log function. This transformation leaves the rest of the tile invariant, and it is thus straightforward to check, that $|t(\vec{q}(\varepsilon))| = |t(\vec{q})|$ holds, which as outlined in [Observation 19](#) leads to [Equation \(9\)](#)

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta := & 4x_2x_3^2 - 2x_3^3 - 2x_2^4x_3^3 + x_2^3(1 + 4x_3^4) - x_2^2x_3(4 + 2x_3^4 - x_3y_2) \\ & - 2x_1x_3^2(-1 + x_2(-2(x_2 - x_3)^2x_3 + y_2)) - x_1^2(2x_2^2x_3^3 - x_2(1 + 4x_3^4) \\ & + x_3(2 + 2x_3^4 - x_3y_2)) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

We will show that this equation does not hold. It is easy to check that $\frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial y_2} = (x_1 - x_2)^2 x_3^2 > 0$ holds, meaning that Δ is maximal for big y_2 . Note that $x_2 y_2 < 1$ has to hold, since q_2 is not on the hyperbola, thus, inserting $y_2 = 1/x_2$ we get that $\Delta' = x_1^2 + x_2^2 - 2x_2x_3 - 2(x_1 - x_2)^2 x_2 x_3^3 \geq 0$ has to hold. As $x_1 < x_2 < x_3$ holds, $\frac{\partial \Delta'}{\partial x_1} = 2x_1 + 4x_2(-x_1 + x_2)x_3^3 > 0$ holds as well. Leading to $x_1 = x_2$ as the maximal possible value for Δ' , we obtain $\Delta'|_{x_1=x_2} = 2x_2(x_2 - x_3) < 0$, contradicting [Equation \(9\)](#). As the equation is a necessary condition for the transformation not being able to lower C_t , the transformation is thus always possible, unless either the slide is exhausted or q_2 reaches the hyperbola/degenerates. ◀

► **Lemma 26.** *Let t be a tile with a slide (q_1, q_2) and a corner (q_2, q_3) . We can replace both sections by a corner (q_1, q'_2) or a sequence of steps and slides between q_1 and q'_2 , obtaining a tile $t' \preceq t$.*

Proof. We have $|t_R(\vec{q})| = 1 + \log(x_2/x_1) + (x_3 - x_2)y_3$ and $C_{t_R}(\vec{q}) = H(q_1, q_2) + T(q_2, q_3) = \frac{1}{4}(1/x_1^2 - x_1^2 - 1/x_2^2 + x_2^2 + 4 \log(x_2/x_1)) + \frac{1}{2}(1/x_2 - x_2 + x_3 - y_3)(x_2 + y_3)$. Where t_R is the part of the tile consisting of the corner/slide. We define the transformation $x_2 \rightarrow x_2 + k\varepsilon, x_3 \rightarrow x_3 + \beta, y_3 \rightarrow y_3 + \varepsilon$. This transformation leaves the tile besides t_R invariant, and as such requiring preservation of tile area, leads to $\beta = \varepsilon + k\varepsilon^2 + \log(x_2) - \log(x_2(x_2\varepsilon - x_3\varepsilon + ky_3 + k\varepsilon))/(y_3 + \varepsilon)$. Thus $|t(\vec{q}(\varepsilon))| = |t(\vec{q})|$ holds, and we can follow [Observation 19](#), and analyze the resulting equations. Note that the defined transformation is dependent on k , and that the equations have to be satisfied for every k , as otherwise there is a k defining a valid transformation which reduces C_t .

For $k = 0$, this results for [Equation \(8\)](#) in $x_2(x_2 + (x_2(x_3 - x_2))/y_3 + 2y_3) = 1$, which reduces to $x_3 = (x_2^3 + y_3 - x_2^2 y_3 - 2x_2 y_3^2)/x_2^2$. Inserting this into [Equation \(9\)](#), again for $k = 0$, we obtain $y_3 < (1 - x_2^2)/(3x_2)$. Returning to a general k for [Equation \(9\)](#), we obtain a quadratic polynomial in k . The coefficient of k^2 then has to be positive, as otherwise we can chose k big enough so that [Equation \(9\)](#) is no longer satisfied. This results in $-x_2^3 + (x_2^4 - x_2^2 - 3)y_3 + 2x_2 y_3^2 > 0$ having to hold. It is easy to check that the left-hand side has positive curvature for y_3 , so only the boundary values $(0 < y_3 < (1 - x_2^2)/(3x_2))$ are of interest. For $y_3 = 0$ the equation does not hold, and inserting $y_3 = (1 - x_2^2)/(3x_2)$ yields $-(7 - 2x_2^2 + x_2^4 + 3x_2^6)/(9x_2) > 0$, which has a single maximum for $x_2^2 \approx 0.767$ at ≈ -0.94 , so the equation does not hold in general. As the equation is a necessary condition for the transformation not being able to lower C_t , the transformation is thus always possible for some k , until either the slide is exhausted or q_3 reaches the hyperbola/degenerates. ◀

► **Lemma 27.** *Let t be a tile with $\rho_t \leq 1/2$, then we can find a tile $\tilde{t} \preceq t$ with one of the following properties:*

- $\Gamma_{\tilde{t}} \subseteq h_{\tilde{t}}$
- \tilde{t} consists of only a step and a double step
- \tilde{t} consists of only a double step
- \tilde{t} consists of only a step and a corner

Proof. By Lemma 24 we first assume one step exists. If $|\Gamma_t \setminus h_t| = 0$, we are done, so we assume $|\Gamma_t \setminus h_t| = 1$. t then has to contain a double step or corner, which by Lemma 23 is located around 1. We can assume that any existing slide is adjacent to the double-step/corner. This is true as otherwise the sections have to be separated by the step, meaning we can use Lemma 21 to exchange the step and the slide to make them adjacent, obtaining a tile $\tilde{t} \preceq t$. By this adjacency we can use Lemma 25 or Lemma 26 to either obtain $|\Gamma_t \setminus h_t| = 0$, or the nonexistence of slides. As such our tile can only consist of a step and a double-step/corner. The possibility of t just consisting of a corner can be excluded, as its density would be larger than $1/2$. With this we obtain the result. \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 28.** *Let t be a tile with $\rho_t \leq 1/2$ with $\Gamma_t \subseteq h_t$. Then $|C_t|/|t| \geq \xi_s(\rho_t)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 24 we can assume that t contains at most one step. Since $\Gamma_t \subseteq h_t$, t can only consist of steps and slides. Using Lemma 21, we can ensure that t has at most one slide. (Note that a slide must exist, as otherwise $\rho_t > 1/2$ holds.) It is enough to show $\Delta := |t|\xi_s(\rho_t) - |C_t| < 0$, since the statement follows by rearranging.

First assume that t 's only section is a slide (q_1, q_2) . Then $|t| = 1 + \ln(x_2/x_1)$, and we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= |t|\xi_s(\rho_t) - H(q_1, q_2) \\ &= |t| - 1 + \sinh(|t| - 1) - \left[\ln z + (z^2 - z^{-2})/4 \right]_{x_1}^{x_2} \\ &= (x_2^{-2} - x_2^2 + x_1^2 - x_1^{-2})/4 + \sinh(|t| - 1) + |t| - (1 + \ln(x_2/x_1)) \\ &= (x_2^{-2} - x_2^2 + x_1^2 - x_1^{-2})/4 + \sinh(\ln(x_2/x_1)) \\ &= 2 \sinh((\ln(x_1) + \ln(x_2))/2)^2 \sinh(\ln(x_1/x_2)) < 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality directly follows from $x_1 < x_2$.

Now assume that t consists of a step (q_1, q_2) and a slide (q_2, q_3) (w.l.o.g. ordered in this way). In such a case we have $|t| = 1 + (x_2 - x_1)/x_2 + \ln(x_3/x_2)$, or rearranged, $x_3 = x_2 e^{x_1/x_2 + |t| - 2}$. Again we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= |t|\xi_s(\rho_t) - (|T(q_1, q_2)| + H(q_2, q_3)) \\ &= |t| - 1 + \sinh(|t| - 1) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{x_1} - \frac{1}{x_2} + x_2 - x_1 \right) \left(x_1 + \frac{1}{x_2} \right) - \left[\ln z + \frac{z^2 - z^{-2}}{4} \right]_{x_2}^{x_3} \end{aligned}$$

Taking the derivative of Δ w.r.t. $|t|$ (after inserting $x_3 = x_2 e^{x_1/x_2 + |t| - 2}$), we obtain $\partial\Delta/\partial|t| = -2 \cosh(x_1/x_2 + |t| - 2 + \ln(x_2)) < 0$. This indicates that Δ is maximized for smallest $|t|$. So assume $|t| = 2$ now, or equivalently, $x_3 = x_2 e^{x_1/x_2}$. By Lemma 20 we can further assume that $x_2 = 1/(\sqrt{2}x_1)$. Using the substitution $x_1 = 2^{-3/4}\sqrt{u}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \left(-3 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{e} + \sqrt{2}e + \frac{1 - e^u}{u} + u + \frac{u}{2e^u} \right) \\ \frac{\partial\Delta}{\partial u} &= \frac{(1 - u)(u^2 + 2e^{2u} - 2e^u(1 + u))}{4\sqrt{2}u^2e^u} \end{aligned}$$

The derivative above has only one zero, namely $u = 1$: From $0 < x_1^2 \leq x_1x_2 = 1/\sqrt{2}$, we can deduce $u \in (0, 2]$ by the substitution. For the right factor of the derivative's numerator we

then get $u^2 + 2e^{2u} - 2e^u(1+u) > 2e^u(e^u - (1+u)) > 0$ from the Taylor series of e^u . Hence checking Δ at u 's boundaries and $u = 1$ is sufficient, where we get $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} \Delta \approx -0.24 < 0$ (apply L'Hospital's rule on $(1 - e^u)/u$), $\Delta|_{u=1} \approx -0.07 < 0$ and $\Delta|_{u=2} \approx -0.26 < 0$. \blacktriangleleft

The following [Lemma 29](#) allows us to restrict ourselves to tiles t with $\rho_t = 1/2$ or where all points in Γ_t are on t 's hyperbola.

► Lemma 29. *Let t be a tile with $\rho_t \leq 1/2$. Then there exists a tile \tilde{t} with $\Gamma_{\tilde{t}} \subseteq h_{\tilde{t}}$ or $\rho_{\tilde{t}} = 1/2$ such that, if $|C_{\tilde{t}}|/|\tilde{t}| \geq \xi_s(\rho_{\tilde{t}})$ then also $|C_t|/|t| \geq \xi_s(\rho_t)$.*

Proof. If $\Gamma_t \subseteq h_t$, then the statement is trivial using $\tilde{t} = t$. Otherwise let $\{q_i\} = \Gamma_t \setminus h_t$. W.l.o.g. assume that there is a point in $q_{i-1} \in \Gamma_t$ with $x_{i-1} < x_i$ (otherwise look at the symmetric case; another point has to exist since $h_t \cap \Gamma_t \neq \emptyset$). We construct a new tile \tilde{t} with $\rho_{\tilde{t}} \leq 1/2$ by moving q up by ε . This changes the area, i.e., $|\tilde{t}| = |t| + \varepsilon w$ for $w = x_i - x_{i-1}$. It is then sufficient to show $|C_t| - \xi_s(\rho_t)|t| > |C_{\tilde{t}}| - \xi_s(\rho_{\tilde{t}})|\tilde{t}|$.

To see this, consider the term $|C_t| - \xi_s(\rho_t)|t| = |C_t| - (|t| - 1 + \sinh(|t| - 1)) =: X$ as we move q . Since 1 or 2 towers are affected by moving q (depending on whether q is part of a double step or a corner), the contribution of those towers to the curvature of X is -1 each by [Observation 6](#) using $\alpha = 1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial X^2}{\partial \varepsilon^2} &= \frac{\partial^2 |C_t|}{\partial \varepsilon^2} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon^2} (|t| + \varepsilon w - 1 + \sinh(|t| + \varepsilon w - 1)) \\ &= -1 \cdot \text{O}(1) - w^2 \sinh(|t| - 1 + \varepsilon w) \\ &= -1 \cdot \text{O}(1) - w^2 \sinh(|\tilde{t}|) < 0 \end{aligned}$$

As $\frac{\partial X^2}{\partial \varepsilon^2} < 0$, ε 's sign can be chosen such that $X = |C_t| - \xi_s(\rho_t)|t|$ decreases (hence we obtain \tilde{t} with $|C_t| - \xi_s(\rho_t)|t| > |C_{\tilde{t}}| - \xi_s(\rho_{\tilde{t}})|\tilde{t}|$).

ε 's magnitude can be chosen such that q_i is moved up onto the hyperbola or q_i is moved down and the tile degenerates, which can be transformed into a new tile \tilde{t} by [Lemma 12](#) with $\tilde{t} \preceq t$. We assumed that $\rho_{\tilde{t}} \leq 1/2$, so the transformation might stop when the density becomes exactly $1/2$ (which is supported by the lemmas statement). \blacktriangleleft

► Lemma 30. *Let t be a tile with $\rho_t \leq 1/2$ consisting only of a double-step (q_1, q_2, q_3) . Then $|C_t|/|t| \geq \xi_s(\rho_t)$.*

Proof. By [Lemma 29](#) we may assume $\rho_t = \frac{1}{2}$ (or $|t| = 2$). We can express this in terms of x_i, y_i to get $|t| = 1 + (x_2 - x_1)y_2 + (\frac{1}{y_3} - x_2)y_3 = 2$, or equivalently, $x_2y_2 = x_2y_3 + x_1y_2$. With the substitution $\chi = x_2y_2, \gamma = x_2/y_2, \alpha = y_3/y_2, \beta = x_1/x_2$, or rearranged, $x_1 = \beta\sqrt{\gamma\chi}, x_2 = \sqrt{\gamma\chi}, y_2 = \sqrt{\chi/\gamma}, y_3 = \alpha\sqrt{\chi/\gamma}$, this equation becomes $\chi(1 - \alpha - \beta) = 0$. We get for C_t :

$$\begin{aligned} |C_t| &= |T(q_1, q_2)| + |T(q_2, q_3)| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{x_1} - y_2 + x_2 - x_1 \right) (x_1 + y_2) + \frac{1}{2} \left(y_2 - y_3 + \frac{1}{y_3} - x_2 \right) (x_2 + y_3) \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\gamma \frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \chi \alpha + \gamma \chi \beta - \frac{1}{\gamma} \chi \alpha^2 - \gamma \chi \beta^2 - \frac{1}{\gamma} \chi - \gamma \chi \right) + \chi(1 - \alpha - \beta) \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\gamma \frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \chi \alpha + \gamma \chi \beta - \frac{1}{\gamma} \chi \alpha^2 - \gamma \chi \beta^2 - \frac{1}{\gamma} \chi - \gamma \chi \right) \\ \frac{\partial |C_t|}{\partial \chi} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} (\alpha(1 - \alpha) - 1) + \gamma (\beta(1 - \beta) - 1) \right) < 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is true since $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$ and $\gamma > 0$ holds. (Note that the derivative w.r.t. χ is justified as the area inequality is independent of $\chi \neq 0$.) From this we obtain a

tile $t' \preceq t$ (namely the one with $\chi = 1$ and same α, β). Since $\chi = 1$, t' consists of exactly two steps. By [Lemma 24](#), we get another tile $t'' \preceq t'$ with at most one step and $\Gamma_{t''} \subseteq h_{t''}$. The statement then directly follows from [Lemma 28](#). \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 31.** *Let t be a tile with $\rho_t \leq 1/2$ consisting only of a double step (q_1, q_2, q_3) and a step (q_3, q_4) . Then $|C_t|/|t| \geq \xi_s(\rho_t)$*

Proof. Then $|t(\vec{q})| = 1 + (x_2 - x_1)y_2 + (x_3 - x_2)/x_3 + (x_4 - x_3)/x_4$ and $|C_t(\vec{q})| = T(q_1, q_2) + T(q_2, q_3) + T(q_3, q_4) = 1/2 \cdot (1/x_1 - y_2 + x_2 - x_1)(x_1 + y_2) + 1/2 \cdot (y_2 - 1/x_3 + x_3 - x_2)(x_2 + 1/x_3) + 1/2 \cdot (1/x_3 - 1/x_4 + x_4 - x_3)(x_3 + 1/x_4)$.

We define the transformation $(x_2 \rightarrow x_2 + \varepsilon, x_4 \rightarrow x_4 + \delta)$. We then require $|t|$ to be left invariant under this transformation, which is true for $\delta = x_4(-1 + x_3^2/(x_3^2 + x_4(x_3y_2 - 1)\varepsilon))$. Following [Observation 19](#) for this transformation we obtain for [Equation \(8\)](#):

$$y_2 = 1/x_3 + (x_3^2(x_1 - 2x_2 + x_3)x_4)/(-x_4 + x_3(2 + x_3x_4^3))$$

Inserting this in [Equation \(9\)](#) we obtain

$$\frac{-4x_3^2 + 4x_3x_4 - (1 + x_3^2(x_1 - 2x_2 + x_3)^2)x_4^2 - 4x_3^3x_4^3 + 2x_3^2x_4^4 + x_3^3(x_1 - 2x_2 + x_3)^2x_4^5 - x_3^4x_4^6}{(x_4 - x_3(2 + x_3x_4^3))^2} \geq 0$$

As the denominator is trivially positive, this is equivalent to:

$$4x_3^2 - 4x_3x_4 + (1 + x_3^2(x_1 - 2x_2 + x_3)^2)x_4^2 + 4x_3^3x_4^3 - 2x_3^2x_4^4 - x_3^3(x_1 - 2x_2 + x_3)^2x_4^5 + x_3^4x_4^6 \leq 0$$

The curvature of the term with respect to x_2 is easily checked to be $-8x_3^2x_4^2(x_3x_4^3 - 1) < 0$, as we try to prove the term to be positive, we are thus only interested in the boundary values of x_2 ($x_1 < x_2 < x_3$). The resulting term turns out to be the same for $x_2 = x_1$ and $x_2 = x_3$, namely $4x_3^2 - 4x_3x_4 + (1 + (x_1 - x_3)^2x_3^2)x_4^2 + 4x_3^3x_4^3 - 2x_3^2x_4^4 - (x_1 - x_3)^2x_3^3x_4^5 + x_3^4x_4^6$. This terms curvature with regards to a is $-2x_3^2x_4^2(x_3x_4^3 - 1) < 0$, meaning again only the boundary $0 < x_1 < x_3$ is relevant. For $x_1 = x_3$ we obtain $(x_4 - x_3(2 + x_3x_4^3))^2 > 0$ and for $x_1 = 0$ we get $4x_3^2 - 4x_3x_4 + x_4^2 + 4x_3^4x_4^2 + 4x_3^3x_4^3 - 2x_3^2x_4^4 - x_3^5x_4^5 + x_3^4x_4^6$. The third derivative of this w.r.t. x_4 is $12x_3^2(2x_4 - x_3)(5x_3^2x_4^2 - 2) > 0$, meaning the second derivative will be minimal for minimal $x_4 = x_3$, with this the second derivative is $2(1 + x_3^4 + 5x_3^8) > 0$, meaning again only the boundary terms of x_4 ($x_3 < x_4 < \infty$) are relevant. For these we get $x_3^2 + 3x_3^6 > 0$ and $+\infty > 0$ respectively. Meaning the term is always positive and thus the transformation is always possible unless either q_2 degenerates/hits the hyperbola, or q_4 degenerates. We thus can transform t such that either $\Gamma_t \subseteq h_t$, or consists of just a double step. In the former case [Lemma 28](#) gives the required property. In the latter case [Lemma 30](#). \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 32.** *Let t be a tile with $\rho_t \leq 1/2$ consisting only of a step (q_1, q_2) where $x_1x_2 \geq 1/\sqrt{2}$ and a corner (q_2, q_3) . Then there exists a tile $t' \preceq t$ only consisting of two steps.*

Proof. Let $x_4 := 1/y_3$. We will first attempt to move q_3 such that $|t| = 1 + (x_2 - x_1)/x_2 + (x_3 - x_2)/x_4$ is invariant, or equivalently, $x_4 = (x_3 - x_2)/u$ for some constant u . In order for $|C_t|$ to decrease, it suffices to look at $|T(q_2, q_3)|$:

$$\begin{aligned} |T(q_2, q_3)| &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{x_2} - \frac{1}{x_4} + x_3 - x_2 \right) \left(x_2 + \frac{1}{x_4} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{x_2} - \frac{u}{x_3 - x_2} + x_3 - x_2 \right) \left(x_2 + \frac{u}{x_3 - x_2} \right) \\ \frac{\partial |T(q_2, q_3)|}{\partial x_3} &= \frac{x_2(2 + x_2x_4(1 + (x_3 - x_2)x_4)) - x_4}{2x_2(x_3 - x_2)x_4^2} \end{aligned}$$

As we assume that q_3 cannot be moved such that $|C_t|$ decreases, we assume that the last term is 0, or equally $(x_3 - x_2)/x_4 = (x_4 - x_2(2 + x_2x_4))/(x_2^2x_4^3)$. Since $x_1 \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2x_2}}$ and $x_2 \geq \sqrt{x_2x_1} \geq 2^{-1/4}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|t| &= 1 + (x_2 - x_1)/x_2 + (x_3 - x_2)/x_4 \\
&\leq 1 + (x_2 - 1/(\sqrt{2x_2}))/x_2 + (x_4 - x_2(2 + x_2x_4))/(x_2^2x_4^3) \\
&= 2 + x_2^{-2}(x_4^{-2} - 2^{-1/2}) - 2x_2^{-1}x_4^{-3} - x_4^{-2} \\
&< 2 + 2^{1/4}x_2^{-1}(x_4^{-2} - 2^{-1/2}) - 2x_2^{-1}x_4^{-3} \\
&= 2 + x_4^{-3}x_2^{-1}(2^{1/4}x_4 - 2 - 2^{-1/4}x_4^3) \\
&\leq 2 + x_4^{-3}x_2^{-1}(2\sqrt{6}/9 - 2) < 2
\end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the assumption that $\rho_t \leq 1/2$, so q_3 must be movable until it lies on the hyperbola, where we get the proclaimed tile $t' \preceq t$. ◀

We are now ready to show [Proposition 14](#).

Proof of Proposition 14. By [Lemma 4](#) we already get the result for $\rho_t > 1/2$. For tiles with $\rho_t \leq 1/2$ we, by [Lemma 27](#), only have to cover the following cases:

- $\Gamma_{t'} \subseteq h_{t'}$. [Lemma 28](#) yields the result.
- t consists of only a double step. [Lemma 30](#) yields the result.
- t consists of a step and a double step. [Lemma 31](#) yields the result.
- t consists of a step and a corner. [Lemma 32](#) yields the result.

As such the bound follows.

It remains to show the tightness. Note that ξ_s exactly corresponds to the tiles $t_l(s)$ and $t_h(s)$ shown in [Figure 8](#) and [Figure 9](#): Both tiles are symmetric tiles. First note that for $\rho_t = 1$, the tightness is trivial by choosing an arbitrary tile t with exactly one upper staircase point.


Let $t = t_l(s)$ and define $\Gamma_t = \{q_1, q_2\}$ with $q_1 = (v, 1/v)$ and $q_2 = (1/v, v)$ for proper $v \in (0, 1)$. We have $|t| = 2 - v^2$, or rearranged $v = \sqrt{2 - 1/\rho_t}$ and we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|C_t|/|t| &= |T(q_1, q_2)|/(2 - v^2) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(1/v - v + 1/v - v)(v + v)/(2 - v^2) \\
&= 2 - 2\rho_t
\end{aligned}$$


Now let $t = t_h(s)$. We define $\Gamma_t = h_t \cap \{(x, y) \mid v \leq x \leq 1/v\}$. t then consists of exactly one slide $(q_1, q_2) = ((v, 1/v), (1/v, v))$. With $|t| = 1 + \ln((1/v)/v) = 1 - 2 \ln(v) \leftrightarrow v = e^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\rho_t}}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|C_t|/|t| &= |H(q_1, q_2)|\rho_t \\
&= \rho_t \left[\ln(z) + \frac{1}{4}(z^2 - z^{-2}) \right]_{e^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\rho_t}}}^{e^{\frac{1}{2\rho_t} - \frac{1}{2}}} \\
&= 1 - \rho_t(1 + \sinh(1 - 1/\rho_t))
\end{aligned}$$

Note that t is only valid in the sense of generalized tiles. However, t can be arbitrarily well approximated by a non-generalized tile with area and crown size arbitrarily close to $|t|$ and $|C_t|$. ◀



■ **Figure 16** Construction with $k = 4$.



■ **Figure 17** Example for a tile created by $p \in P_{\epsilon,k}$. For demonstration purposes, the light blue areas are not shown to scale; in truth they are significantly smaller than X, Y .

C Full Proof of the Upper Bound

In this section, we give the full details for the construction used to show the upper bound in [Theorem 2](#). Our construction is parametrized by k , A , and ϵ . The main idea is the following (cf. [Section 6](#)): we construct a point set where **TILEPACKING** fails to cover an area larger than roughly $(1 - e^{-2})/2$.

To simplify the analysis, we rotate the unit square \mathcal{U} clockwise by 45 degrees and let \mathcal{U}_r denote the unit square \mathcal{U} rotated clockwise by 45 degrees around the origin. Observe that in \mathcal{U}_r , **TILEPACKING** processes the points from right to left.

Recall that our goal is to construct an *L-shaped tile* with low density, where each maximal rectangle has roughly the same size A . To this end, we place a large number of points q_i on a hyperbola h_A . We then add for each point q_i on h_A a set of points $p_{i,j}$ with $x(p_{i,j}) = x(q_i) + j\epsilon$ where $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $p_{i,j} \in \mathcal{U}_r$. To get a density close to $1/2$, the y -coordinates of the points $p_{i,j}$ are chosen as follows: we place the points $p_{i,j}$ on arcs of functions f_i described by differential equations (see below), where each f_i depends on the two neighboring curves f_{i-1} and f_{i+1} .

Observe that **TILEPACKING** processes the outer q_i before the inner ones. This means, once the tile for some outer point q_i has been fixed, the remaining tiles for of all inner points on f_j will be restricted by t_{q_i} .

We start by formally defining the point set $P_{\epsilon,k}$ and the functions f_i . Let $h_A = \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{U}_r \mid x^2 - y^2 = 2A\}$ be the right branch of a hyperbola centered in the origin

that lives in \mathcal{U}_r . First we define the upper part of the construction with non-negative y coordintes. For $i = 0, \dots, k-1$, densely choose k points $q_i \in h_A$ such that $y(q_i) \geq 0$ and $\sqrt{2A} = x(q_0) < x(q_1) < \dots < x(q_k)$. For $i = 0$ and $i = k$, define $f_0(x) = 0$ and $f_k(x) = \sqrt{2} - x$. For $0 < i < k$, define $f_i : [0, \sqrt{2}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ using

$$f_i(x(q_i)) = y(q_i) \tag{10}$$

and

$$f'_i(x) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{for } x \leq x(q_i) \\ 1 - 2 \frac{f_i(x) - f_{i-1}(x)}{f_{i+1}(x) - f_{i-1}(x)} & \text{for } x > x(q_i). \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

This means, each f_i with $0 < i < k$ has slope -1 in $[0, x(q_i))$, then it intersects h_A in q_i according to (10), and then it has a slope depending on f_{i-1} and f_{i+1} according to (11).

For the symmetric part with negative y coordinates we define $q_{-i} = (x(q_i), -y(q_i))$ and $f_{-i}(x) = -f_i(x)$ for $0 < i < k$. Observe that $q_{-i} \in h_A$ and the f_{-i} adhere to (11). Finally, define $f_{-k} = -f_k$. We are now ready to define the point set $P_{\varepsilon, k}$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ as

$$P_{\varepsilon, k} = \{(0, 0)\} \cup \bigcup_{i, j \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ (j\varepsilon, f_i(j\varepsilon)) \mid -k < i < k, x(q_i) \leq j\varepsilon < \sqrt{2} \right\}.$$

We assume that ε and the q_i are chosen such that ε divides all $x(q_i)$. This implies that $q_i \in P_{\varepsilon, k}$ for all $-k < i < k$. We now show basic properties for the functions f_i .

► **Lemma 33.** *Each function f_i intersects h_A exactly once, namely in q_i . Furthermore, $f_i(x)$ is differentiable for all $i = -k, \dots, k$, and $f_{-k}(x) < \dots < f_k(x)$.*

Proof. By the choice of the q_i , we have $f_{-k}(0) < \dots < f_k(0)$. As long as $f_{-k}(x) < \dots < f_k(x)$, the $f_{i+1}(x) - f_{i-1}(x)$ denominators in the differential equations are positive and therefore the functions are by definition differentiable and thus continuous. Then we can also show that each f_i cannot have more than one shared point with h_A : we have $|f'_i| = |1 - 2(f_i(x) - f_{i-1}(x))/(f_{i+1}(x) - f_{i-1}(x))| \leq 1$. W.l.o.g. consider the upper branch of h_A with the functional form $h = \sqrt{x^2 - 2A}$, then we get $|f'_i| \leq 1 \leq x/\sqrt{x^2 - 2A} = h'$, so there cannot be more than one shared point.

Assume now that the functions are not always ordered, then choose the smallest $\tilde{x} < \sqrt{2}$ such that $f_i(\tilde{x}) = f_{i-1}(\tilde{x})$ for some i . W.l.o.g. we can assume that $f_{i+1}(\tilde{x}) > f_i(\tilde{x})$ (otherwise choose $i+1$ instead or consider the symmetric case). Note that such an i must exist, as otherwise all functions f_i meet, which is impossible since the functions f_k and f_{-k} only meet at $x = \sqrt{2}$.

Define the function $\delta := f_i - f_{i-1}$. There exists a $v > 0$ such that $f_{i+1}(x) - f_{i-1}(x) \geq v$ holds for all $x \leq \tilde{x}$, where f_i is well-defined by its differential equation. When evaluating the functions at x , we get

$$\delta' = f'_i - f'_{i-1} = 1 - f'_{i-1} - 2 \frac{f_i - f_{i-1}}{f_{i+1} - f_{i-1}} \geq -2 \frac{\delta}{v}$$

where the last inequality follows from $f_{i+1}(x) - f_{i-1}(x) \geq v$, as well as the properties of the derivative. We therefore see that δ decays (at most) exponentially and can never reach 0, contradicting our assumption of $\delta(\tilde{x}) = f_i(\tilde{x}) - f_{i-1}(\tilde{x}) = 0$. ◀

► **Lemma 34.** *Let $u, k > 0$ and $\hat{\mathcal{U}} = (\bigcup_{p \in P_{\varepsilon, k}, x(p) \leq \sqrt{2}-u} t_p) \setminus \hat{t}$. Then TILEPACKING covers $|\hat{\mathcal{U}}|/2 + c(\varepsilon)$ area in $\hat{\mathcal{U}}$ for $P_{\varepsilon, k}$ where $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} c_k(\varepsilon) = 0$.*

Proof of Lemma 34. By Lemma 33, we get $f_{-k}(x) < \dots < f_k(x)$, ensuring that all f_i reside in \mathcal{U}_r . Now consider a point $p \neq (0, 0)$, $x(p) \leq \sqrt{2} - u$ that lies on some curve f_j and creates the tile t . Assuming $\varepsilon < u$, there exists another point $p' = (x(p) + \varepsilon, f_j(x(p) + \varepsilon)) \in P_{\varepsilon, k}$. By Lemma 33, we can assume that $f_{i+1}(x) - f_i(x) > \varepsilon$ for all $i = -k, \dots, k-1$, $x \leq \sqrt{2} - u$. It follows from $|f'_i| \leq 1$ that p' is a lower staircase point. (For the same reason there cannot be points further to the right that are lower staircase points.) t is therefore only restricted by the tiles from points with x -coordinate $x(p')$, giving it an L -shape (see Figure 17).

TILEPACKING will choose the larger one of the two maximal rectangles R_1 and R_2 . Depending on the processing order, TILEPACKING will process any of the points with the x -coordinate $x(p)$ first. This gives rise to areas that can be either covered by t or the tile of a point on the neighboring curve. As we will see, these areas are negligible, so w.l.o.g. we assume that t covers them.

Since all f_i are differentiable in $[0, \sqrt{2}]$, Taylor's Theorem provides the existence of a function $g(x)$ with $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} g(x) = 0$ such that $f_i(x + \varepsilon) = f_i(x) + f'_i(x) \cdot \varepsilon + g(\varepsilon) \cdot \varepsilon$.

Denote by w, h the dimensions of the rectangle $r = R_1 \cap R_2$. Then $w = (\varepsilon + f_i(x(p) + \varepsilon) - f_i(x(p)))/\sqrt{2} = (\varepsilon + f'_i(x(p))\varepsilon + g(\varepsilon)\varepsilon)/\sqrt{2} = (1 + f'_i(x(p)) + g(\varepsilon))\varepsilon/\sqrt{2}$ and similarly $h = (1 - f'_i(x(p)) - g(\varepsilon))\varepsilon/\sqrt{2}$.

Let Z be the total area of r plus all areas that could have been covered by neighboring tiles of points with the same x -coordinate $x(p)$. It is easy to see that $Z = O(\varepsilon^2)$.

t also contains two additional rectangles with an area of $X = w((f_i(x(p)) - f_{i-1}(x(p)))/\sqrt{2} - h)$ and $Y = h((f_{i+1}(x(p)) - f_i(x(p)))/\sqrt{2} - w)$. Note that this also holds if $x(q_{i\pm 1}) > x(p)$, as we extended $f_{i\mp 1}$ with lines of slope ± 1 . In this case the two rectangles are restricted by $q_{i\mp 1}$'s tile, respectively.

Hence, when evaluating the functions at $x(p)$:

$$\begin{aligned} |X - Y| &= |w(f_i - f_{i-1})/\sqrt{2} - h(f_{i+1} - f_i)/\sqrt{2}| \\ &= |(1 + f'_i + g(\varepsilon))(\varepsilon(f_i - f_{i-1}))/2 - (1 - f'_i - g(\varepsilon))(\varepsilon(f_{i+1} - f_i))/2| \\ &= |(f_{i+1}(g(\varepsilon) + f'_i - 1) - f_{i-1}(g(\varepsilon) + f'_i + 1)) + 2f_i| \cdot \varepsilon/2 \\ &= |(g(\varepsilon)(f_{i+1} - f_{i-1}) + f'_i(f_{i+1} - f_{i-1}) - f_{i-1} - f_{i+1} + 2f_i)| \cdot \varepsilon/2 \\ &= |g(\varepsilon)||f_{i+1} - f_{i-1}| \cdot \varepsilon/2 \\ &\leq |g(\varepsilon)| \cdot \varepsilon\sqrt{2} \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by Lemma 33 and $f_k(x) - f_{-k}(x) \leq 2\sqrt{2}$ in $[0, \sqrt{2}]$.

W.l.o.g. assume $X > Y$. Then for the tile t with area $|t| = X + Y + Z$, TILEPACKING covers at most $Z + X \leq Z + X/2 + (Y + |g(\varepsilon)| \cdot \varepsilon\sqrt{2})/2 = |t|/2 + O(\varepsilon(|g(\varepsilon)| + \varepsilon))$. As $\hat{\mathcal{U}}$ is the union of such tiles and $|P_{\varepsilon, k}| = O(k/\varepsilon)$, we have a total coverage of $|\hat{\mathcal{U}}|/2 + O(k(|g(\varepsilon)| + \varepsilon))$. This immediately gives us the function $c_k(\varepsilon) = O(k(|g(\varepsilon)| + \varepsilon))$ with $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} c_k(\varepsilon) = 0$. ◀

► **Theorem 35.** *TILEPACKING has no better lower bound than $(1 - e^{-2})/2$.*

Proof. We analyze the area ρ covered by TILEPACKING on $P_{\varepsilon, k}$ for some fixed k and u as ε approaches 0. The bound then follows from letting k go to ∞ and u go to 0.

By Lemma 34, TILEPACKING covers half of $\hat{\mathcal{U}} = (\bigcup_{p \in P_{\varepsilon, k}, x(p) \leq \sqrt{2} - u} t_p) \setminus \hat{t}$ (plus $c_k(\varepsilon)$ that approaches 0 for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) for each $u > 0$. Additionally, at most u^2 area is covered from all tiles at points p with $x(p) > \sqrt{2} - u$. TILEPACKING covers at most $A + Q$ area in \hat{t} , where at most $Q = \max_i (x(q_i) - x(q_{i-1})) + \max_i (y(q_i) - y(q_{i-1}))$ is additionally covered due to the q_i points only providing an approximation of h_A . (Note that all q_i lie in $P_{\varepsilon, k}$, so no additional error is introduced.) In total, using $E = Q + c_k(\varepsilon) + u^2$,

$$\rho \leq A + |\hat{\mathcal{U}}|/2 + E$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq A + (1 - |\hat{t}|)/2 + E \\ &\leq A + (1 - (A + \int_A^1 \frac{A}{x} dx))/2 + E \\ &\leq (1 + A + A \ln A)/2 + E \end{aligned}$$

Minimizing the last term leads to $\rho = (1 - e^{-2})/2 + E$ at $A = e^{-2}$. Q approaches 0 when k goes to ∞ since the q_i points lie densely on $h_A \cap \mathcal{U}_r$. Therefore the error term E approaches 0 for large k and small u, ε . ◀