

**ON THE NUMBER OF
DIRECTIONS IN VISIBILITY
REPRESENTATIONS OF GRAPHS**

Evangelos Kranakis, Danny Krizanc and
Jorge Urrutia

TR-248 JULY 1994

School of Computer Science, Carleton University
Ottawa, Canada, K1S 5B6

ON THE NUMBER OF DIRECTIONS IN VISIBILITY REPRESENTATIONS OF GRAPHS

(Extended Abstract)

Evangelos Kranakis*[†]
(kranakis@scs.carleton.ca)

Danny Krizanc*[†]
(krizanc@scs.carleton.ca)

Jorge Urrutia[‡]
(jorge@csi.uottawa.ca)

Abstract

We consider visibility representations of graphs in which the vertices are represented by a collection \mathcal{O} of non-overlapping convex regions on the plane. Two points x and y are visible if the straight-line segment xy is not obstructed by any object. Two objects $A, B \in \mathcal{O}$ are called visible if there exist points $x \in A, y \in B$ such that x is visible from y . We consider visibility only for a finite set of directions. In such a representation, the given graph is decomposed into a union of unidirectional visibility graphs, for the chosen set of directions. This raises the problem of studying the number of directions needed to represent a given graph. We study this number of directions as a graph parameter and obtain sharp upper and lower bounds for the representability of arbitrary graphs.

1980 Mathematics Subject Classification: 68R10, 68U05

CR Categories: F.2.2

Key Words and Phrases: Graph, Number of directions, Polygon, Visibility.

Carleton University, School of Computer Science: SCS-TR-248

Note: This paper will be submitted for publication elsewhere.

*Carleton University, School of Computer Science, Ottawa, ON, Canada

[†]Research supported in part by NSERC (Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada) grant.

[‡]University of Ottawa, Department of Computer Science, Ottawa, ON, Canada

1 Introduction

We consider visibility representations of graphs in which the vertices are represented by a collection \mathcal{O} of non-overlapping convex regions on the plane. Two points x and y are visible if the straight-line segment xy is not obstructed by any object $A \in \mathcal{O}$. Two objects $A, B \in \mathcal{O}$ are called visible if there exist points $x \in A, y \in B$ which are visible. This gives rise to a graph with vertices the given objects. For a given direction, two such objects are “adjacent” if and only if one object is visible from the other along the given direction. It is well-known and also easy to prove that graphs which admit such a unidirectional representation must be planar [4, 6]. There have been several results in the literature which investigate the recognition problem for such a graph representation. Complete characterizations exist for unidirectional representations as well as partial results for 2-directional representations [3, 4, 6].

Every graph can be represented as the visibility graph of a collection of non-overlapping convex regions in such a way that the given graph is decomposed into a union of unidirectional visibility graphs for an appropriately chosen set of directions. Indeed, draw the graph on the plane such that the edges are straight line segments and no three vertices are on the same line. Now replace the vertices with sufficiently small circles. Clearly, every graph can be represented with $|E|$ directions, where E is the set of edges. This raises the problem of studying the number of directions needed to represent a given graph. We study this number of directions as a graph parameter and obtain upper and lower bounds for arbitrary as well as specific graphs. We call a graph k -directional if it can be represented this way with at most k directions.

1.1 Definitions

Let \mathcal{O} be a collection of n non-overlapping, convex regions on the plane. For any given direction ϕ we define the visibility graph among these objects along direction ϕ as follows:

1. vertices of the graph are the n objects,
2. for a, b objects, $\{a, b\}$ is an edge if and only if a is visible from b along direction ϕ .

As pointed out before, for every graph $G = (V, E)$ we can find a collection of n plane, non-overlapping convex objects such that G can be represented




Figure 1: Reducing objects to straight-line segments.

as the union of graphs $G_\phi = (V, E_\phi)$, $\phi \in \Phi$, where Φ is an appropriately selected set of directions. We denote with $\text{dir}(G)$ the minimum number $|\Phi|$ of directions needed to represent G . It is clear from the definitions that $\text{dir}(G) \leq |E|$.

In addition, we will also consider the case where only directions are considered for which no two objects have the same supporting line. We denote with $\text{dir}^*(G)$ the minimum number $|\Phi|$ of directions needed to represent G in this way. A related graph parameter is the thickness of a graph G , denoted by $\theta(G)$, and is defined in [1] as follows: it is the smallest number of planar subgraphs whose union is G . A well-known result [4, 6] states that undirected graphs are planar. This implies that $\theta(G) \leq \text{dir}(G) \leq \text{dir}^*(G) \leq |E|$.

In general, we make the assumption that our objects are compact convex sets. For a given direction and any convex object on the plane it is clear that the visibility of the object is fully determined by the line segment which is delimited by the convex object and the tangents to the object parallel to the given direction (see Figure 1). For this reason (as it is customary) for any fixed direction we will represent the objects as line segments perpendicular to the given direction. In a similar manner we can define the quantities $\text{dir}_{seg}(G)$, $\text{dir}_{seg}^*(G)$, where the set \mathcal{O} of objects consists of finite straight-line segments. Although not explicitly proved, the results of Section 2 are still valid for these parameters. The necessary modifications are left to the reader.

1.2 Results of the paper

Here is a summary of the results of the paper. In Section 2 we consider techniques for determining the size of $\text{dir}(G)$ for arbitrary graphs G . The quantity $\text{dir}^*(G)$ has a different behavior. It turns out that one can obtain sharper bounds on $\text{dir}^*(G)$ when the given graph has girth at least four.

This enables us to determine the number of directions for several special graphs, like multidimensional grids, complete bipartite, etc. In Section 3 we give strong lower bounds on the number of directions needed to represent a graph when the objects are polygons. In particular, we show the existence of n vertex graphs G such that $\text{dir}_{seg}(G) = \Omega(n^2/\log n)$. In Section 4 we consider unidirectional representations of graphs in three dimensions where the objects are polygons parallel to the xy -plane. We show that all hamiltonian graphs have such a representation and give a tight bound on the number of vertices of the polygons.

2 Number of Directions

In this section we obtain estimates on the parameters $\text{dir}(G)$ and $\text{dir}^*(G)$. For any graph G let \bar{G} denote the complement of G ; this has the same set of vertices, but two points are adjacent in \bar{G} if and only if they are not adjacent in G .

Theorem 2.1 *For any graph G , either $\text{dir}(G) = \Omega(n)$ or $\text{dir}(\bar{G}) = \Omega(n)$.*

PROOF (OUTLINE) The theorem will follow from the following lemmas.

Lemma 2.1 ([4, 6]) *Unidirectional graphs are planar.* ■

Lemma 2.2 *For any graph $G = (V, E)$ on n vertices we have that $\text{dir}(G) \geq |E|/3(n-2)$.*

PROOF Let Φ be a set of directions representing the graph G for a given set of objects. Let E_ϕ be the set of edges corresponding to direction ϕ . We know that $E = \bigcup_{\phi \in \Phi} E_\phi$ and therefore $|E| = \sum_{\phi \in \Phi} |E_\phi|$. However each graph G_ϕ is planar. Hence $|E_\phi| \leq 3(n-2)$, which proves the desired result. ■

Now we can finish the proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a given graph. If $|E| \geq n(n-1)/4$ then by Lemma 2.2 $\text{dir}(G) = \Omega(n)$. Otherwise, the complement of G must have at least $n(n-1)/4$ edges, in which case the same lemma applies. This proves the theorem. ■

For graphs with girth ≥ 4 we can prove a better lower bound.

Theorem 2.2 *For any graph $G = (V, E)$ on n vertices and girth at least 4 we have that $\text{dir}^*(G) \geq |E|/(n-1)$.*

PROOF (OUTLINE) First we need the following simple lemma.




Figure 2: Representing the 8-node cycle with one direction.

Lemma 2.3 ([4, 6]) *No cycle of more than 3 nodes is representable with only one direction, when no two segment endpoints form a line parallel to the given direction.* ■

To prove the main theorem we argue as before. Let Φ be a set of directions representing the graph G for a given set of objects. Let E_ϕ be the set of edges corresponding to direction ϕ . We know that $E = \bigcup_{\phi \in \Phi} E_\phi$ and therefore $|E| = \sum_{\phi \in \Phi} |E_\phi|$. Since the girth of G is ≥ 4 the graph G_ϕ (see Lemma 2.3) cannot have any cycles. Hence it is a tree and we have that $|E_\phi| \leq n - 1$. This proves the theorem. ■

It is easy to show that any planar graph can be represented as a unidirectional visibility graph on the plane by using line segments which may be open or closed at their end-points. However, by lemma 2.3, when we deal with compact sets and the graph parameter dir^* this result is obviously false. In fact this leads us to the following conjecture.

Conjecture 2.1 *There is constant k such that every planar graph is a k -directional visibility graph.*

Note that the quantities $\text{dir}(G)$ and $\text{dir}^*(G)$ may be unequal. This is due to the fact that although all cycles are unidirectional (see Figure 2), every cycle C of more than three nodes must satisfy $\text{dir}^*(C) > 1$.

The parameter $\text{dir}^*(G)$ is not monotonic for the subgraph property, i.e. if G is a subgraph of G' then it is not in general true that $\text{dir}^*(G) \leq \text{dir}^*(G')$. To see this take an arbitrary planar graph G with girth 4. Such a graph requires at least 2 directions. For any interior face add a vertex and connect this vertex with every vertex of the face. The resulting graph G' is triangulated and planar, hence $\text{dir}^*(G') = 1$. However, it is easy to see that for any graph G , if the clique K_r is a subgraph of G then $\text{dir}^*(K_r) \leq \text{dir}^*(G)$.




Figure 3: Representing the cartesian product graph $L_n \times G$.

2.1 Special graphs

An interesting case occurs when we consider the number of directions for representing the product of graphs (for the definitions see [1]). We say that the representation \mathcal{O} of a graph has a visibility gap if there are two directions ϕ_1, ϕ_2 such that for every $x \in \mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{O}$ any line through x with direction ϕ , $\phi_1 \leq \phi \leq \phi_2$, intersects no object of \mathcal{O} except \mathcal{O} . Now we can prove the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4 *Let P_n denote the path on n vertices. For any graph G which has a visibility gap,*

$$\text{dir}^*(P_n \times G) \leq 1 + \text{dir}^*(G).$$

PROOF (OUTLINE) Consider a representation of the graph G with a set of directions Φ such that $\text{dir}(G) = |\Phi|$ for a given collection of objects. By applying an appropriate linear geometric transformation we can reduce as much as we wish the span of the directions of the graph, i.e. we can assume that $\Phi \subseteq (\pi/2 - \epsilon, \pi/2 + \epsilon)$, where $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently close to $\pi/2$. We arrange n copies of the graph G on the path P_n such that in no two different graphs are the corresponding copies of the objects pairwise visible along the directions in Φ . Using the fact that the graph G has a visibility gap, we can add a new direction $\phi = 0$ and guarantee that the copies of the convex objects are such that the corresponding weak visibility graph is the cartesian product $P_n \times G$ (see Figure 3). ■

For special graphs like multidimensional grids, hypercubes, etc we can give more precise bounds on the number of directions needed for their visibility representation. Namely, we can prove the following result.




Figure 4: Representing the complete graph K_{n+2} .

Theorem 2.3

1. $\lfloor (n+7)/6 \rfloor \leq \text{dir}(K_n) \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$.
2. $\frac{mn}{m+n-1} \leq \text{dir}^*(K_{m,n}) \leq \min\{m, n\}$.
3. $\text{dir}^*(M_n^d) = d$, for n sufficiently large, where M_n^d is the d dimensional grid of side n .
4. $\lfloor (n+1)/4 \rfloor \leq \text{dir}(Q_n) \leq \lfloor n/3 \rfloor$ and $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor \leq \text{dir}^*(Q_n)$, where Q_n is the n -dimensional hypercube.

PROOF (OUTLINE) We give only an outline of the required constructions. An $n(n-1)/6(n-2)$ lower bound in part (1) follows directly from Lemma 2.2. Using the formula for the thickness of K_n (see [1][page 120]) we can improve this to $\lfloor (n+7)/6 \rfloor$. The upper bound is proved by induction on n (see Figure 4). We show how to construct a representation of K_{n+2} from a representation of K_n by adding only one new direction. As in Lemma 2.4 we may apply a geometric transformation that reduces the span of the set of directions of K_n . Assume that the objects representing K_n are sufficiently small and add two new objects A, B as depicted in Figure 4. The result now follows by induction and from the fact that $\text{dir}(K_2) = \text{dir}(K_3) = 1$.

The lower bounds in parts (2) and (3) follow directly from Theorem 2.2. The upper bound of $\text{dir}^*(M_n^d)$ follows from the fact that the d -dimensional




Figure 5: Representing the complete bipartite graph $K_{m,n}$.

grid M_n^d is the direct product graph of d copies of P_n and Lemma 2.4. The upper bound for part (2) follows from the representation depicted in Figure 5. The upper bound $\text{dir}(Q_n) \leq \lceil n/3 \rceil$ follows from the fact that $\text{dir}(Q_3) = 1$ (since Q_3 is a hamiltonian graph) and using the analogue of Lemma 2.4 for the product graph $Q_3 \times G$ (i.e. $\text{dir}(Q_3 \times G) \leq 1 + \text{dir}(G)$, provided that G has a visibility gap). The lower bound for $\text{dir}(Q_n)$ follows from the fact that $\theta(Q_n) = \lceil (n+1)/4 \rceil$ (see [1][page 121]). ■

3 Lower Bounds

In this section we use a result of H. Warren [8] on the number of sign patterns of a set of polynomials in order to prove the existence of graphs whose representation requires superlinear number of directions.

Let p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m be polynomials in r variables and for $x = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$ let the sign-pattern at x be the vector $(\text{sgn } p_1(x), \dots, \text{sgn } p_m(x))$ consisting of $+1$ and -1 . Let $s(p_1, \dots, p_m)$ be the number of different sign-patterns for all values of $x \in \mathbf{R}^r$.

Our main theorem makes use of the following result of H. Warren [8].

Lemma 3.1 *If p_1, \dots, p_m are polynomials in r variables with degree $\leq d$ then the number of sign-patterns is $s(p_1, \dots, p_m) \leq \left(\frac{4edm}{r}\right)^r$.* ■

The following theorem is the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.1 *For any class \mathcal{G} of n -vertex graphs there exist graphs $G \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\text{dir}_{\text{seg}}(G) = \Omega(\log |\mathcal{G}| / \log n)$.*

PROOF (OUTLINE) Let \mathcal{G} be a class of graphs on n vertices and suppose that k directions are sufficient to represent every graph in the class. First

let us consider the case where the objects representing the graphs are line segments. There are n finite, straight line segments determined by their endpoints. For any given direction the visibility of any pair of line segments is determined by whether or not a straight line with slope the given direction and emanating from one straight line segment intersects the other straight line segment. This easily gives rise to $O(n^4k)$ polynomial conditions in at most $4n + 2k$ variables. By Warren's theorem the number of sign patterns is bounded above by

$$\left(\frac{n^4kC}{4n + 2k} \right)^{4n+2k},$$

where C is a constant. In order to represent all possible graphs this quantity must be at least $|\mathcal{G}|$. Taking logarithms and ignoring lower order terms this means that $k = \Omega(\log |\mathcal{G}| / \log n)$. This proves the theorem. ■

As a special case we obtain the existence of graphs G on n vertices such that

$$\text{dir}_{\text{seg}}(G) = \Omega(n^2 / \log n).$$

A similar theorem (though weaker) holds when the objects are convex sets. In this case every direction gives rise to n parallel straight line segments (see Figure 1), for a total of kn segments. Hence using Warren's theorem we obtain the following result.

Theorem 3.2 *For any class \mathcal{G} of n -vertex graphs there exist graphs $G \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\text{dir}(G) = \Omega(\log |\mathcal{G}| / n \log n)$.* ■

A better lower bound would be possible if the objects representing the graphs were convex polygons. More precisely, as in Theorem 3.1, we can prove the following result.

Theorem 3.3 *For any class \mathcal{G} of n -vertex graphs there exist graphs $G \in \mathcal{G}$ requiring $\Omega(\log |\mathcal{G}| / \log m)$ directions for their visibility representation by convex polygons whose total number of edges is $m \geq n$.* ■

4 Three dimensional representations

In contrast to the two dimensional case, we can obtain unidirectional representations in three dimensional space for a large class of graphs. Here we assume that the objects are polygons which are parallel to the xy -plane. In the proofs below it will be convenient to use the standard terminology and definitions on the page number of a graph [2, 9].

Theorem 4.1 *Every graph G which has a hamiltonian path has a unidirectional representation in three dimensional space, where each object is a convex polygon with at most $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ vertices, and this bound is tight.*

PROOF (OUTLINE) We give only an outline of the algorithm. First we show how to represent hamiltonian, one-page graphs. Initially, we represent the vertices of the graph as segments of equal length. The segments are parallel and their corresponding endpoints form two parallel straight lines. This represents the hamiltonian path. Next, beginning with the outermost edges of the graph we augment appropriately the lengths of the adjacent vertices so that the visibility representation of the segments coincides with the representation of the given graph. Clearly, this shows that hamiltonian, one-page graphs have a unidirectional representation with parallel segments.

We use the transformation above for graphs of arbitrary page number p . We represent each page with parallel segments and join the corresponding vertices to form polygons with p vertices. In general, these will be star-polygons. However, it is easy to see that in the transformation of the previous paragraph we can adjust at will the range of length of the segments representing our graph. This easily implies that the corresponding polygons may be assumed to be convex with p vertices (notice that if $p = 2$ then the representation can be assumed to be planar).

First we prove an $n - 1$ upper bound. It is easy to see that the complete graph K_n can be represented with $n - 1$ pages, where the vertices on the spine form a hamiltonian path. To represent G put a hamiltonian path of G on the spine and delete edges of K_n which are not edges of G . This gives a representation of G on at most $n - 1$ pages. Now the previous argument implies the desired result.

The proof of the $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ upper bound is based on a partition of the set of edges of the complete graph into $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ paths. The partition can be such that each path lies on a page. This and the previous argument implies the required bound for any graph G . The reason this bound is tight is that K_n has exactly $n(n - 1)/2$ edges and, not counting the edges on the spine, no page can have more than $n - 1$ edges. ■

We can give a related theorem for the case of planar graphs, where the visibility representation uses star polygons having $O(1)$ vertices. Namely we can prove the following result.

Theorem 4.2 *Every planar graph G has a unidirectional representation in three dimensional space, where each object is a 10-vertex star polygon.*

PROOF (OUTLINE) We give an outline of the algorithm. The representation with star-shaped polygons follows by induction on the number of vertices of the planar graph. First we give a representation with overlapping star-polygons on the plane; here adjacency means that two polygons overlap. By “lifting” the polygons in parallel in three dimensional space we get the desired representation.

We use the fact that every planar graph has a vertex of degree at most 5. Delete such a vertex from the given planar graph. The remaining graph has a representation satisfying the conditions of the theorem. Now add the deleted vertex and represent it as a star polygon which overlaps only its adjacent star polygons. This gives the desired representation. ■

5 Conclusion

In this paper we have studied the number of directions needed in the visibility representations of graphs. We have obtained several sharp upper and lower bounds for general as well as special graphs. Several interesting questions concern tightening the existing upper and lower bounds. For example, as shown in Section 3, Theorem 3.1 implies there exist graphs with lower bound $n^2/\log n$ on the quantity dir_{seg} . Can we improve this lower bound? A similar question applies when the objects are convex sets: Is it true that $\text{dir}(G) \leq n$, for every graph G ? It would also be interesting to know if $\text{dir}(G)$ is bounded above by a constant when G ranges over planar graphs.

Another interesting problem concerns the complexity of the problem $\text{dir}(G) \leq k$, for G a graph on n nodes and k constant (or variable). In particular, is there an efficient (even approximation) algorithm for computing the function $\text{dir}(G)$? We conjecture that this is not true.

A rather intriguing question concerns the study of the number of directions needed for the visibility representation of the product graph $H \times G$ in terms of $\text{dir}(H), \text{dir}(G)$. For example, is it true that $\text{dir}(H \times G) \leq \text{dir}(H) + \text{dir}(G)$? (Similar question for dir^* .)

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Mark Noy for suggesting the use of Lemma 3.1 and Michel Pocchiola for useful conversations.

References

- [1] F. Harary, "Graph Theory", Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.
- [2] L. S. Heath and S. Istrail, "The Pagenumber of Genus g Graphs is $O(g)$ ", in STOC87, pages 388 - 397.
- [3] J. O'Rourke, "Computational Geometry Column 18", International Journal of Computational Geometry & Applications, pp. 107-113, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1993.
- [4] I. Rival and J. Urrutia, "Representing Orders on the Plane by Translating Convex Figures", Order 4 (1988), 319-329.
- [5] I. Rival and J. Urrutia, "Representing Orders by Moving Figures in Space", Discrete Mathematics 109 (1992), 255-263.
- [6] R. Tamassia and I. G. Tollis, "A Unified Approach to Visibility Representations of Planar Graphs", Discrete Comput. Geom. 1:321-341, 1986.
- [7] R. Tamassia and I. G. Tollis, "Plane Representations of Graphs and Visibility Between Parallel Segments", TR ACT-37, Univ. of Ill., Urbana Champaign, 1985.
- [8] H. Warren, "Lower Bounds for Approximation by Nonlinear Manifolds", Transactions of the AMS 133(1968), 167-178.
- [9] M. Yannakakis, "Four Pages are Necessary and Sufficient for Planar Graphs", in STOC86, pages 104 - 108.

**School of Computer Science, Carleton University
Recent Technical Reports**

- TR-206 Enumeration Problems Relating to Dirichlet's Theorem**
Evangelos Kranakis and Michel Pocchiola, April 1992
- TR-207 Distributed Computing on Anonymous Hypercubes with Faulty Components**
Evangelos Kranakis and Nicola Santoro, April 1992
- TR-208 Fast Learning Automaton-Based Image Examination and Retrieval**
B. John Oommen and Chris Fothergill, June 1992
- TR-209 On Generating Random Intervals and Hyperrectangles**
Luc Devroye, Peter Epstein and Jörg-Rüdiger Sack, July 1992
- TR-210 Sorting Permutations with Networks of Stacks**
M.D. Atkinson, August 1992
- TR-211 Generating Triangulations at Random**
Peter Epstein and Jörg-Rüdiger Sack, August 1992
- TR-212 Algorithms for Asymptotically Optimal Contained Rectangles and Triangles**
Evangelos Kranakis and Emran Rafique, September 1992
- TR-213 Parallel Algorithms for Rectilinear Link Distance Problems**
Andrzej Lingas, Anil Maheshwari and Jörg-Rüdiger Sack, September 1992
- TR-214 Camera Placement in Integer Lattices**
Evangelos Kranakis and Michel Pocchiola, October 1992
- TR-215 Labeled Versus Unlabeled Distributed Cayley Networks**
Evangelos Kranakis and Danny Krizanc, November 1992
- TR-216 Scalable Parallel Geometric Algorithms for Coarse Grained Multicomputers**
Frank Dehne, Andreas Fabri and Andrew Rau-Chaplin, November 1992
- TR-217 Indexing on Spherical Surfaces Using Semi-Quadcodes**
Ekow J. Otoo and Hongwen Zhu, December 1992
- TR-218 A Time-Randomness Tradeoff for Selection in Parallel**
Danny Krizanc, February 1993
- TR-219 Three Algorithms for Selection on the Reconfigurable Mesh**
Dipak Pravin Doctor and Danny Krizanc, February 1993
- TR-220 On Multi-label Linear Interval Routing Schemes**
Evangelos Kranakis, Danny Krizanc, and S.S. Ravi, March 1993
- TR-221 Note on Systems of Polynomial Equations over Finite Fields**
Vincenzo Acciari, March 1993
- TR-222 Time-Message Trade-Offs for the Weak Unison Problem**
Amos Israeli, Evangelos Kranakis, Danny Krizanc and Nicola Santoro, March 1993
- TR-223 Anonymous Wireless Rings**
Krzysztof Diks, Evangelos Kranakis, Adam Malinowski, and Andrzej Pelc, April 1993
- TR-224 A consistent model for noisy channels permitting arbitrarily distributed substitutions, insertions and deletions**
B.J. Oommen and R.L. Kashyap, June 1993
- TR-225 Mixture Decomposition for Distributions from the Exponential Family Using a Generalized Method of Moments**
S.T. Sum and B.J. Oommen, June 1993
- TR-226 Switching Models for Non-Stationary Random Environments**
B. John Oommen and Hassan Masum, July 1993

- TR-227 **The Probability of Generating Some Common Families of Finite Groups**
Vincenzo Acciari, September 1993
- TR-228 **Power Roots of Polynomials over Arbitrary Fields**
Vincenzo Acciari, September 1993
- TR-229 **Optimal Parallel Algorithms for Direct Dominance Problems**
Amitava Datta, Anil Maheshwari and Jörg-Rüdiger Sack, October 1993
- TR-230 **Uniform Generation of Forests of Restricted Height**
M.D. Atkinson and J.-R. Sack, October 1993
- TR-231 **Optimal Elections in Labeled Hypercubes**
Paola Flocchini and Bernard Mans, December 1993
- TR-232 **On the Complexity of Computing Gröbner Bases in Characteristic 2**
Vincenzo Acciari, December 1993
- TR-233 **Broadcasting Session Keys**
Mike Just, Evangelos Kranakis, Danny Krizanc, and Paul van Oorschot, February 1994
- TR-234 **String Taxonomy Using Learning Automata**
B. John Oommen and Edward V. de St. Croix, March 1994
- TR-235 **Distributed Cyclic Reference Counting**
Frank Dehne and Rafael D. Lins, March 1994
- TR-236 **Exact and Approximate Computational Geometry Solutions of an Unrestricted Point Set Stereo Matching Problem**
Frank Dehne and Katia Guimaraes, March 1994
- TR-237 **Scalable and Architecture Independent Parallel Geometric Algorithms with High Probability Optimal Time**
Frank Dehne, Claire Kenyon and Andreas Fabri, March 1994
- TR-238 **Finding the Extrema of a Distributed Multiset**
Paola Alimonti, Paola Flocchini and Nicola Santoro, March 1994
- TR-239 **Killing Two Birds with One Stone**
Evangelos Kranakis, Danny Krizanc, Anil Maheshwari, Jörg-Rüdiger Sack, Jorge Urrutia, April 1994
- TR-240 **Some Computational Problems on Central Simple Algebras over \mathbb{Q}**
Vincenzo Acciari, April 1994 (Not available)
- TR-241 **Extending Cryptographic Logics of Belief to Key Agreement Protocols**
Paul C. van Oorschot, May 1994
- TR-242 **Modern Key Agreement Techniques**
Rainer A. Rueppel and Paul C. van Oorschot, May 1994
- TR-243 **On Unifying Some Cryptographic Protocol Logics**
Paul F. Syverson and Paul C. van Oorschot, May 1994
- TR-244 **Efficient DES Key Search**
Michael J. Wiener, May 1994
- TR-245 **Optimal Fault-Tolerant Leader Election in Chordal Rings**
Bernard Mans and Nicola Santoro, May 1994
- TR-246 **Information Privacy in Canada (Legislation in the Face of Changing Technologies)**
Václav Matyás, Jr., June 1994
- TR-247 **Randomized Encryption with Insertions and Deletions Based on Probability Distributions**
B. John Oommen and P.C. van Oorschot, June 1994
- TR-248 **On the Number of Directions in Visibility Representations of Graphs**
Evangelos Kranakis, Danny Krizanc and Jorge Urrutia, July 1994