

Treemaps with Bounded Aspect Ratio*

Mark de Berg¹

Bettina Speckmann¹

Vincent van der Weele²

¹ Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, TU Eindhoven, The Netherlands.

mdberg@win.tue.nl and speckman@win.tue.nl

² Max-Planck-Institut für Informatik, Saarbrücken, Germany.

vdweele@mpi-inf.mpg.de

Abstract

Treemaps are a popular technique to visualize hierarchical data. The input is a weighted tree \mathcal{T} where the weight of each node is the sum of the weights of its children. A treemap for \mathcal{T} is a hierarchical partition of a rectangle into simply connected regions, usually rectangles. Each region represents a node of \mathcal{T} and the area of each region is proportional to the weight of the corresponding node. An important quality criterium for treemaps is the aspect ratio of its regions. Unfortunately, one cannot bound the aspect ratio if the regions are restricted to be rectangles. Hence Onak and Sidiropoulos in SoCG 2008 introduced *polygonal partitions*, which use convex polygons. We are the first to obtain convex partitions with optimal aspect ratio $O(\text{depth}(\mathcal{T}))$. Furthermore, we consider rectilinear partitions, which retain more of the schematized flavor of standard rectangular treemaps. Our rectilinear treemaps have constant aspect ratio, independent of $\text{depth}(\mathcal{T})$ or the number and weight of the nodes. The leaves of \mathcal{T} are represented by rectangles, L-, and S-shapes and internal nodes by orthoconvex polygons.

We also consider the important special case that $\text{depth}(\mathcal{T}) = 1$, that is, single-level treemaps. We prove that it is strongly NP-hard to minimize the aspect ratio of a rectangular single-level treemap. On the positive side we show how to construct rectilinear and convex single-level treemaps with constant aspect ratio. Our rectilinear single-level treemaps use only rectangles and L-shapes and have aspect ratio at most $2 + 2\sqrt{3}/3$. The convex version uses four different octilinear shapes and has aspect ratio at most $9/2$.




Fig. 1: Treemaps constructed by our drawing algorithms: single-level orthoconvex, single-level convex, hierarchical orthoconvex, hierarchical convex.

*Bettina Speckmann was supported by the Netherlands' Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) under project no. 639.022.707.

1 Introduction


Treemaps are a very popular technique to visualize hierarchical data [12]. The input is a tree \mathcal{T} where every leaf is associated with a weight and where the weight of an internal node is the sum of the weights of its children. A treemap for \mathcal{T} is a hierarchical partition of a simple polygon, usually a rectangle, into simply connected regions, often rectangles as well. Each such region represents a node of \mathcal{T} and the area of each region is proportional to the weight of the corresponding node. To visualize the hierarchical structure the region associated with a node must contain the regions associated with its children. Shneiderman [13] and his colleagues were the first to present an algorithm for the automatic creation of rectangular treemaps. Treemaps have since been used to visualize hierarchical data from a variety of application areas, for example, stock market portfolios [8], tennis competitions trees [7], large photo collections [3], and business data [16].

One of the most important quality criteria for treemaps is the aspect ratio of its regions; users find it difficult to compare regions with extreme aspect ratios [9]. Hence several approaches [3, 4] try to “squarify” the regions of a rectangular treemap. However, one cannot bound the aspect ratio if the regions are restricted to be rectangles. (Consider a tree consisting of two leaves and a root and let the weight of one leaf tend to zero.) As a consequence, several types of treemaps using region shapes other than rectangles have been proposed. Balzer and Deussen [1, 2] use centroidal Voronoi tessellations. Their algorithm is iterative and can give no guarantees on the aspect ratio of the regions produced (and also not on the exact size of the regions). Wattenberg [17] developed treemaps whose regions follow a space filling curve on a grid, so called Jigsaw maps. Jigsaw maps assume integer weights, which must add up to a square number, for the leaves of \mathcal{T} . The regions of the maps are rectilinear, but highly non-(ortho)convex. However, they do have aspect ratio 4.

At SoCG 2008 Onak and Sidiropoulos [11] introduced *polygonal partitions*, which use convex polygons. They proved an aspect ratio of $O((\text{depth}(\mathcal{T}) \cdot \log n)^{17})$ for a tree \mathcal{T} with n leaves. In cooperation with De Berg, this bound has since been improved to $O(\text{depth}(\mathcal{T}) + \log n)$ [5]. The latter paper also gives a lower bound construction of $\Omega(\text{depth}(\mathcal{T}))$.

Results and organization. We are the first to obtain convex partitions with optimal aspect ratio $O(\text{depth}(\mathcal{T}))$. Our recursive drawing procedure is described in Section 3.2. Furthermore, we consider rectilinear partitions, which retain more of the schematized flavor of standard rectangular treemaps (see Section 3.1). Our rectilinear treemaps have constant aspect ratio, independent of $\text{depth}(\mathcal{T})$ or the number and weight of the nodes. The leaves of \mathcal{T} are represented by rectangles, L-, and S-shapes, and internal nodes by orthoconvex polygons.

We also consider the important special case that $\text{depth}(\mathcal{T}) = 1$, that is, single-level treemaps. Pie charts are frequently used to depict such proportional data, but they should be avoided for larger data sets, since it is difficult to compare different sections of a given pie chart [14]. Single-level treemaps offer a good alternative. In Appendix A.1




we prove that it is strongly NP-hard to minimize the aspect ratio if the regions are restricted to be rectangles.¹ In Section 2.1 we describe a recursive drawing procedure that uses L-shapes in addition to rectangles. The resulting treemap has aspect ratio at most $2 + 2\sqrt{3}/3 \approx 3.15$. In Appendix A.2 we give a construction which forces a maximal aspect ratio of ≈ 3.13 for such treemaps. In Section 2.2 we describe an alternative drawing procedure that uses four octilinear shapes and has aspect ratio at most $9/2$. In Appendix C we show some experimental results for our four drawing algorithms. All proofs omitted due to space constraints can be found in the appendix.

Preliminaries. Our input is a rooted tree \mathcal{T} . Following [5] we say that \mathcal{T} is *properly weighted* if each node ν of \mathcal{T} has a positive weight $\text{weight}(\nu)$ that equals the sum of the weights of the children

¹This result was already claimed without proof in [4], but it was in fact only a conjecture of the authors (personal communication with J.J. van Wijk and K. Huizing, November 2010).

of ν . We assume that the weights are normalized, that is, $\text{weight}(\text{root}(\mathcal{T})) = 1$. A treemap for \mathcal{T} associates a region $R(\nu)$ with each node $\nu \in \mathcal{T}$ such that (i) $R(\text{root}(\mathcal{T}))$ is the unit square, (ii) for every node we have $\text{area}(R(\nu)) = \text{weight}(\nu)$, and (iii) for any node ν , the regions associated with the children of ν form a partition of $R(\nu)$.

The aspect ratio of a treemap is the maximum aspect ratio of any of its regions. For a rectangle of width w and height h , aspect ratio is typically defined as $\max(w/h, h/w)$. For axis-aligned rectangles, this is equivalent to the following, more general, definition. Let R be a region and $\sigma(R)$ its smallest enclosing axis-aligned square. Furthermore, let $\text{area}(R)$ be its area. The aspect ratio of R is defined as $\text{asp}(R) := \text{area}(\sigma(R)) / \text{area}(R)$. This definition of aspect ratio is convenient for rectilinear or octilinear regions. However, for the convex regions of the convex partitions of Section 3.2 we use the following, alternative, definition in accordance with [5]: the aspect ratio of a convex region R is $\text{diam}(R)^2 / \text{area}(R)$. Since $\text{area}(\sigma(R)) \leq \text{diam}(R)^2 \leq 2 \text{area}(\sigma(R))$, the aspect ratios obtained by the two definitions differ by at most a factor 2.



The following two lemmas deal with partitioning the children of a node according to weight and with partitioning a rectangular region. We denote the set of children of a node ν by $\text{children}(\nu)$.

Lemma 1 *Suppose all children of node ν have weight at most $t \cdot \text{weight}(\nu)$, for some $3/10 \leq t \leq 2/3$. Then we can partition $\text{children}(\nu)$ into two subsets H_1 and H_2 , such that*

$$\text{weight}(H_2) \leq \text{weight}(H_1) \leq \begin{cases} 2t \cdot \text{weight}(\nu) & \text{if } 3/10 \leq t < 1/3; \\ 2/3 \cdot \text{weight}(\nu) & \text{if } 1/3 \leq t \leq 2/3. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 2 *Let R be a rectangle and $w_1 \geq w_2$ be weights such that $w_1 + w_2 = \text{area}(R)$. Then we can partition R into two subrectangles R_1, R_2 whose aspect ratios are at most $\max(\text{asp}(R), \text{area}(R)/w_2)$.*


2 Single-level treemaps

Here we consider the special case that $\text{depth}(\mathcal{T}) = 1$, that is, single-level treemaps. Our input is hence a set of n positive weights $\mathcal{T} = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\}$. We assume that the weights are given in non-increasing order and are normalized, that is, $\text{weight}(\mathcal{T}) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i = 1$. A treemap for \mathcal{T} is a partition of the unit square into n disjoint regions R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n such that $\text{area}(R_i) = w_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. We strive to give bounds on the maximal aspect ratio A_{\max} of any region R_i .


2.1 Orthoconvex

We describe a recursive drawing algorithm that uses L-shapes and rectangles. We do not recurse on L-shapes, these are used only for single high weights. At each recursive step we are given a rectangle R with aspect ratio $\text{asp}(R)$ and a subset of \mathcal{T} . We always assume the weights to be normalized. Initially R is the unit square. Our drawing algorithm guarantees a bound on the maximal aspect ratio A_{\max} . To this end, we maintain an invariant aspect ratio $A_I \leq A_{\max}$, such that $\text{asp}(R) \leq A_I$ for all rectangles R . Let t be a threshold parameter with $0 < t < 1$. We say that a weight w_i is *high* iff $w_i \geq t$. We first describe our drawing algorithm and then show how to minimize A_{\max} as a function of A_I and t . Based on the maximal weight w_1 and the aspect ratio of R we distinguish three cases:

1. The maximal weight w_1 is high and R is (nearly) square. In this case, we draw R_1 as an L-shape and recurse on the remainder R' of R and the remaining weights. We specify later what ‘nearly square’ exactly means.
2. The maximal weight w_1 is high and R is elongated. In this case, we draw R_1 as a rectangle and recurse on the remainder R' of R and the remaining weights.



3. The maximal weight w_1 is low. Thus all weights are low and we can split them into two subsets of approximately equal weight (Lemma 1). We cut R accordingly and recurse on the sub-rectangles R' and R'' and their corresponding subsets.



For Case 1 we must ensure that (i) the aspect ratio of the L-shape R_1 does not exceed A_{\max} : $\text{asp}(R_1) \leq A_{\max}$, and (ii) the aspect ratio of the remainder meets the invariant: $\text{asp}(R') \leq A_I$. For Case 2, we must ensure that (iii) the aspect ratio of the shaded rectangle R_1 does not exceed A_{\max} : $\text{asp}(R_1) \leq A_{\max}$, and (iv) the aspect ratio of the remainder meets the invariant: $\text{asp}(R') \leq A_I$. For Case 3, we must ensure that (v) the aspect ratios of both subrectangles meet the invariant: $\text{asp}(R') \leq A_I$ and $\text{asp}(R'') \leq A_I$.

Case 1 & 2: the maximal weight w_1 is high. Requirement (ii) is easily met. By definition the aspect ratio of an L-shape is independent of the shape of the rectangle that is “cut out”. Therefore, we choose to cut out a rectangle that is *similar* to R . This choice prevents the L-shape from having skinny parts and, moreover, $\text{asp}(R') = \text{asp}(R) \leq A_I$.

We analyse Requirements (i) and (iii) next. In Case 1 the aspect ratio of the L-shape is $\text{asp}(R)/w_1$ which does not exceed A_{\max} iff $w_1 \geq \text{asp}(R)/A_{\max}$. In Case 2 the aspect ratio of the shaded rectangle is $\max(w_1 \cdot \text{asp}(R), 1/(w_1 \cdot \text{asp}(R)))$, by definition, which does not exceed A_{\max} if $1/(\text{asp}(R) \cdot A_{\max}) \leq w_1 \leq A_{\max}/\text{asp}(R)$. We visualize these constraints in Fig. 2(a) which shows the possible drawings as a function of w_1 . The order of the boundaries stems from the known inequalities $1 \leq \text{asp}(R) \leq A_{\max}$. Since $0 < w_1 < 1$, we can ignore the part for $w_1 \geq 1$. The constraints visualized in Fig. 2(a) immediately imply $t \geq 1/(\text{asp}(R) \cdot A_{\max})$. Since $\text{asp}(R) \geq 1$ we can simplify this to $t \geq 1/A_{\max}$.




Fig. 2: Graphical representation of the possible drawings as function of w_1

For Requirement (iv) we have to ensure that $\text{asp}(R') \leq A_I$, that is, $(1 - w_1) \cdot \text{asp}(R) \leq A_I$ and $1/((1 - w_1) \cdot \text{asp}(R)) \leq A_I$. The former is trivially true, since $(1 - w_1) < 1$ and $\text{asp}(R) \leq A_I$. The latter inequality is met if we have $w_1 \leq 1 - 1/(\text{asp}(R) \cdot A_I)$. Consider Fig. 2(b) and (c), which show the two options for the position of $1 - 1/(\text{asp}(R) \cdot A_I)$ compared to $\text{asp}(R)/A_{\max}$. To guarantee a valid drawing for all $w_1 \geq t$ we need to choose A_I and A_{\max} in such a way that $\text{asp}(R)/A_{\max} \leq 1 - 1/(\text{asp}(R) \cdot A_I)$, as depicted in Fig. 2(c). The following lemma proves that this is possible if we choose A_I large enough (note here that $A_I \geq 2$ is a lower bound obtained by splitting a square into two equal parts).

Lemma 3 For $A_I \geq (1 + \sqrt{5})/2 \approx 1.62$ and for all valid $\text{asp}(R)$, it holds that $A_{\max} \geq \frac{A_I^3}{A_I^2 - 1}$ implies $\text{asp}(R)/A_{\max} \leq 1 - 1/(\text{asp}(R) \cdot A_I)$.


Case 3: the maximal weight w_1 is low. In Case 3, $w_i < t$ holds for all w_i . We partition \mathcal{T} into two sets \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 . By Lemma 2, the drawing of \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 has aspect ratio $\max(\text{asp}(R), 1/(1 - \text{weight}(\mathcal{T}_1)))$. This aspect ratio must meet the invariant, so $1/(1 - \text{weight}(\mathcal{T}_1)) \leq A_I$.

An upper bound on A_{\max} . Summarizing the inequalities from the discussion above, we have (1) $t \geq 1/A_{\max}$, (2) $A_{\max} \geq A_I^3/(A_I^2 - 1)$, and (3) $A_I \geq 1/(1 - \text{weight}(\mathcal{T}_1))$. Combining Lemma 1 with the latter two inequalities, we obtain: $1/3 \leq t \leq 2/3$ implies $A_{\max} \geq 27/8$. Now observe that by Inequality (1) we must have $t \geq 8/27$ to find t and A_I that minimize A_{\max} . Hence we now consider only $t \in [8/27, 1/3)$. In fact, we can further narrow the range for t to $t \in [3/10, 1/3)$ without losing optimality. Then, via Lemma 1 we can establish that $\text{weight}(\mathcal{T}_1) \leq 2t$. Combining this with the inequalities (1)-(3), we get two new requirements on A_{\max} : $A_{\max} \geq 1/(8t^3 - 12t^2 + 4t)$ and $A_{\max} \geq 1/t$. The minimum value of A_{\max} that satisfies both inequalities is $A_{\max} = 2 + \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{3}$.


Theorem 1 *Every properly weighted single-level tree \mathcal{T} can be represented by an orthoconvex treemap which uses only rectangles and L-shapes and has aspect ratio at most $2 + \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{3}$.*

2.2 Convex

In Section 2.1 we showed how to create orthoconvex treemaps with low aspect ratio, using only rectangles and L-shapes. Here we describe a similar approach for convex treemaps which uses only the four octilinear shapes depicted to the right. The pentagon plays the role of the L-shape, that is, we never recurse on a pentagon. At every recursive step we are given a region R which is either a rectangle, triangle, or a chisel. We split the set \mathcal{T} into two subsets \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 (with \mathcal{T}_1 having higher weight) and draw these in two subregions of R . We distinguish two cases, based on the maximal weight w_1 . In the figures, \mathcal{T}_1 is drawn in the subregion marked by the dot. The threshold t is higher than in the rectilinear case, namely $t = 2/3$.




1. The maximal weight is high. The corresponding region is drawn first (shaded) and we recurse on the remainder of R and the remainder of the weights.
2. The maximal weight is low. We partition the set of weights into two subsets of roughly the same total weight. R is split into two according to these weights and each subset is drawn in its own part of R .




We aim for $A_{\max} = 9/2$. To this end we need to ensure that all rectangles in the recursion have aspect ratio at most 3 and all chisels have aspect ratio at most $9/2$. Since we use only equilateral right-angled triangles their aspect ratio is 2. Like for an L-shape, the aspect ratio of a pentagon inside a given rectangle is determined solely by the area of the shape that is “cut out”, be it a rectangle or a triangle. Hence we can use the same analysis as in the previous section to show that all subregions that are created by cutting a rectangle meet the invariants. A triangle is cut into a chisel and a smaller triangle. The smallest axis-aligned bounding square of the chisel is twice as large as the original triangle. Therefore, the chisel has aspect ratio $2/w(\mathcal{T}_1)$. Since \mathcal{T}_1 is the larger subset, the chisel has aspect ratio at most 4.

The aspect ratio of a chisel C increases with the aspect ratio of its smallest enclosing axis-aligned rectangle $\rho(C)$. We can cut C in two different directions. An *orthogonal cut* induces two subregions called *base* (rectangle or pentagon) and *tip* (chisel or triangle). A *parallel cut* induces two chisels called *long* and *short*. The aspect ratio of the tip is always smaller than the aspect ratio C . We denote the relative area of a subregion R' w.r.t. C by $\text{rel}_C(R') = \text{area}(R')/\text{area}(C)$.



Lemma 4 *For any orthogonal cut of a chisel C we have $\text{asp}(\text{base}) \leq \max\left(c \cdot \text{asp}(\rho(C)), 2/(\text{rel}_C(\text{base}) \cdot (2 \cdot \text{asp}(\rho(C)) - 1))\right)$, where $c = \text{rel}_C(\text{base})$ for a rectangular base and $c = 1$ for a pentagon.*

If w_1 is high, it follows from Lemma 4 that the base has aspect ratio at most $9/2$. If w_1 is small, we must not only show that the base has low aspect ratio, but also that it is rectangular, as we cannot recurse on pentagons. Our algorithm always draws the smaller subtree in the base. Therefore, the base is a rectangle if the rectangular part of the chisel is at least as large as its beveled part. This is the case if the chisel has aspect ratio at least $9/4$. Lemma 4 then implies that the base has aspect ratio at most 3, provided that $\text{weight}(\mathcal{T}_2) \geq 1/3$ which is guaranteed by Lemma 1.



It remains to consider the case where all weights are low and the chisel has aspect ratio less than $9/4$. Here we have to use a parallel cut. The chisel and its long subchisel have the same smallest axis-parallel bounding square, hence the long subchisel has aspect ratio $A_R/\text{weight}(\mathcal{T}_1) \leq 9/2$. For the short subchisel, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 5 *For any parallel cut of a chisel C we have $\text{asp}(\text{short}) \leq \text{asp}(\text{long})$ if and only if $\text{rel}_C(\text{long}) \leq \text{asp}(\rho(C))/(2 \cdot \text{asp}(\rho(C)) - 1)$.*

It is not hard to see that $\text{asp}(\rho(C)) < 3/2$ if $A_R < 9/4$. Also, we may assume that $\text{weight}(\mathcal{T}_1) \leq 2/3$, by Lemma 1. Therefore, $\text{rel}_C(\text{long}) \leq \text{asp}(\rho(C))/(2 \cdot \text{asp}(\rho(C)) - 1)$ and hence, $\text{rel}_C(\text{short}) \leq 9/2$.

Theorem 2 *Every properly weighted single-level tree \mathcal{T} can be represented by a convex treemap which uses only four octilinear shapes and has aspect ratio at most $9/2$.*

3 Hierarchical treemaps

We now consider drawings of full trees. Our drawing algorithms work on binary trees, so we have to convert the input tree to a binary one. For orthoconvex drawings, we can simply replace each node of degree $k > 2$ by a subtree of $k - 1$ binary nodes. For convex drawings, we have to be more careful. This conversion is described in Section 3.2.

3.1 Orthoconvex

We describe a recursive algorithm for computing a treemap of constant aspect ratio for a properly weighted binary tree. Our algorithm uses *staircases*: polygons defined by a horizontal edge uv , a vertical edge vw , and an xy -monotone chain of axis-parallel edges connecting u to w . The vertex v is called the *anchor* of the staircase. At each recursive step we are given a rectangle R with aspect ratio at most 8 and a tree \mathcal{T} . Exactly one node ν in \mathcal{T} and exactly one corner of R is *marked*. Initially \mathcal{T} is the input tree, R is the unit square, and the root of \mathcal{T} and the bottom-right corner of R are marked. We strive to compute a treemap for \mathcal{T} inside R with the following properties:

- (i) every leaf is drawn as a rectangle of aspect ratio at most 8, or as an L- or S-shape of aspect ratio at most 32;
- (ii) every internal node is drawn as an orthoconvex polygon of aspect ratio at most 64;
- (iii) the marked node μ as well as its ancestors are drawn as staircases whose anchors coincide with the marked corner of R .

The third property is not a goal in itself, but it is necessary to maintain to be able to guarantee the other two. We now describe how to draw \mathcal{T} inside R . As before, we assume that $\text{weight}(\text{root}(\mathcal{T})) = 1$. Our algorithm distinguishes cases depending on the weights of certain nodes. To this end we partition the weights into four categories:

- *tiny nodes*: nodes ν such that $\text{weight}(\nu) < 1/8$;
- *small nodes*: nodes ν such that $1/8 \leq \text{weight}(\nu) < 1/4$;
- *large nodes*: nodes ν such that $1/4 \leq \text{weight}(\nu) \leq 7/8$;
- *huge nodes*: nodes ν such that $\text{weight}(\nu) > 7/8$.

For a node ν we use \mathcal{T}_ν to denote the subtree rooted at ν . Moreover, we write $p(\nu)$ for the parent of ν and $s(\nu)$ for the sibling of ν . We need the following lemma.

Lemma 6 *Let ν be a non-tiny node. Then \mathcal{T}_ν contains a non-tiny leaf or a node that is small or large.*

Proof. If ν is small or large we are done, so assume ν is huge. Walk from ν down \mathcal{T}_ν , always proceeding to the heavier child (breaking ties arbitrarily) until we reach a leaf or a non-huge node. Since the heavier child of a huge node is huge or large, this ends in a huge leaf or a large node. \square



We now discuss the various cases that we distinguish, show how the algorithm handles them, and prove (using induction) that each of the cases is handled correctly. In the base case \mathcal{T} consists of a single leaf node, so its region is simply the rectangle R . This trivially satisfies conditions (i)–(iii). So now assume \mathcal{T} has more than one node.

In the following, whenever we mark a node in a tree that already has a marked node μ , we implicitly assume that the mark is removed from μ . In the description below—in particular in the figures illustrating our approach—we assume without loss of generality that the bottom-right corner of container R is marked and that $\text{width}(R) \geq \text{height}(R)$.

Case (a): \mathcal{T} has a non-tiny marked node μ . By Lemma 6, \mathcal{T}_μ contains a node ν that is either a non-tiny leaf or a small or large internal node. Let \mathcal{T}' be the tree obtained from \mathcal{T} by removing \mathcal{T}_ν and contracting $s(\nu)$ into $p(\nu)$. In \mathcal{T}' we mark $s(\nu)$ and in \mathcal{T}_ν we mark ν . We distinguish two subcases.


If $\text{weight}(\nu) \leq 7/8$ then we split R into two subrectangles R' and $R(\nu)$, one for \mathcal{T}' and one for \mathcal{T}_ν . We put $R(\nu)$ to the right of R' and mark the bottom-right corner of both. Note that R' and $R(\nu)$ have aspect ratio at most 8, according to Lemma 2. We recursively draw the trees in their respective rectangles.

If $\text{weight}(\nu) > 7/8$ then ν must be a leaf. We then draw ν as an L-shape $R(\nu)$ and recursively draw \mathcal{T}' inside a rectangle R' which is *similar* to R , whose top-left corner coincides with the top-left corner of R , and whose bottom-right corner is marked.




In both subcases properties (i)–(iii) hold. Indeed, the recursive calls only draw leaf regions having property (i) and the L-shaped leaf in the second subcase has aspect ratio at most $64/7$. Moreover, all internal nodes have property (ii). For the nodes that are not an ancestor of ν this follows by induction. For the ancestors of ν , the orthoconvexity follows from the fact that the recursive call on \mathcal{T}' has property (iii), and the relative positions of $R(\nu)$ and the marked corner of R' . Because ν is non-tiny and $\text{asp}(R) \leq 8$, the regions for the ancestors of ν have aspect ratio at most 64. The marked node μ as well as all of its ancestors have property (iii), because each such node is an ancestor of the marked node $s(\nu)$ in \mathcal{T}' , the induction hypothesis, and the relative positions of $R(\nu)$ and the marked corner of R' .

Case (b): \mathcal{T} has a tiny marked node μ with an ancestor that is small or large. Let μ^* be the lowest huge ancestor of μ —since the root is huge, μ^* must exist—and let $\hat{\mu}$ be the child of μ^* on the path to μ . Then $\hat{\mu}$ is small or large. We obtain \mathcal{T}' by removing $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mu}}$ and contracting $s(\hat{\mu})$ into its parent. We mark $s(\hat{\mu})$ in \mathcal{T}' , and μ remains marked in $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mu}}$.




We split R into two rectangles R' and $R(\hat{\mu})$, one for \mathcal{T}' and one for $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mu}}$. Since $\hat{\mu}$ is small or large, the aspect ratios of R' and $R(\hat{\mu})$ are at most 8, according to Lemma 2. We put $R(\hat{\mu})$ to the right of R' , mark the bottom-right corner in both, and recursively draw \mathcal{T}' in R' and $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mu}}$ in $R(\hat{\mu})$.




The leaf regions all have property (i) by induction. Property (ii) holds as well. For the nodes that are not an ancestor of $\hat{\mu}$ this follows by induction. For the ancestors of $\hat{\mu}$, the orthoconvexity follows from the fact that the recursive call on \mathcal{T}' has property (iii), and the relative positions of R' and the marked corner of $R(\hat{\mu})$. Because $\hat{\mu}$ is non-tiny, the regions for the ancestors of $\hat{\mu}$ have aspect ratio at least 64. Property (iii) follows from the fact that the recursive calls on \mathcal{T}' and $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mu}}$ have property (iii) and from the relative position of R' and the marked corners of $R(\hat{\mu})$ and R' .

Case (c): \mathcal{T} has a tiny marked node μ without small or large ancestors, but \mathcal{T} has a large or huge leaf λ .

Define μ^* and $\hat{\mu}$ as in Case (b). Note that $\hat{\mu}$ must be tiny, since μ does not have small or large ancestors and μ^* is the lowest huge ancestor. Also note that λ must be in the other subtree of μ^* (the one not containing $\hat{\mu}$ and μ). Now \mathcal{T}' is obtained from \mathcal{T} by removing $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mu}}$ and λ , and contracting $s(\hat{\mu})$ and $s(\lambda)$ into their parents. We mark $s(\lambda)$ in \mathcal{T}' and keep μ marked in $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mu}}$. We draw $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mu}}$ in a rectangle $R(\hat{\mu})$ similar to R , in the bottom-right of R , with its bottom-right corner marked.



If \mathcal{T}' is tiny we draw it as a rectangle R' similar to R , in the top-left of R ; otherwise \mathcal{T}' is drawn as a rectangle R' on the left side of R . Note that in the latter case the aspect ratio of R' is at most 8. In both cases we mark the bottom-right corner of R' . The region $R(\lambda)$ for λ is drawn in between R' and $R(\hat{\mu})$, which means it is either an S-shape or an L-shape.





All leaves in \mathcal{T}' and $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mu}}$ have property (i) by the induction hypothesis. Since λ is large or huge, the aspect ratio of $R(\lambda)$ is at most 32. Properties (ii) and (iii) follow using the induction hypothesis on \mathcal{T}' and $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mu}}$, similarly to the previous two cases.

Case (d): \mathcal{T} has a tiny marked node μ without small or large ancestors, and \mathcal{T} has no large or a huge leaf.

Define μ^* and $\hat{\mu}$ as in Case (b) and (c). As in Case (c), $\hat{\mu}$ is tiny, so $\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mu}}$ has weight at least $7/8$. We search for a node $\hat{\nu}$ such that $\text{weight}(\hat{\nu}) \leq 6/8$. This can be done by descending from μ^* , always proceeding to the heavier child, until we reach such a node. Observe that $\text{weight}(\hat{\nu}) \geq 3/8$.

Let \mathcal{T}' be obtained by removing $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mu}}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\nu}}$, marking $s(\hat{\nu})$ and contracting it in its parent. By construction, \mathcal{T}' is not tiny. Let ν in $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\nu}}$ be a small node; such a node ν exists since there are no large or huge leaves and the weight of $\hat{\nu}$ is at least $3/8$. Let $\mathcal{T}'_{\hat{\nu}}$ be the tree obtained from $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\nu}}$ by removing \mathcal{T}_{ν} , marking $s(\nu)$ and contracting it into its parent. Let \mathcal{T}_r be constructed by joining $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mu}}$ and \mathcal{T}_{ν} with a new root r , as shown.

We partition R into three rectangles—one for \mathcal{T}' , one for $\mathcal{T}'_{\hat{\nu}}$, and one for \mathcal{T}_r . We mark them as shown in the figure, and recurse. Since all three subtrees are non-tiny the rectangles on which we recurse all have aspect ratio at most 8.



All leaf regions have property (i) by induction. Moreover, all internal nodes have property (ii). For the nodes that are not an ancestor of ν this follows by induction. For nodes on the path from $\hat{\nu}$ to

ν we can argue as follows. $R(\hat{\mu})$ is a staircase anchored at the bottom-right corner of the rectangle of \mathcal{T}_r , and so $R(\nu)$ is a staircase anchored at the opposite corner. Because the top-right corner of the rectangle of $\mathcal{T}'_{\hat{\nu}}$ is marked, this implies that the nodes from $\hat{\nu}$ to ν are drawn as orthoconvex polygons. A similar argument applies to the ancestors of $\hat{\nu}$. The nodes that are not an ancestor of ν have aspect ratio at most 64 by induction. The ancestors of ν are not tiny, since ν is not tiny, and $\text{asp}(R) \leq 8$, hence all the regions have aspect ratio at most 64.

It remains to argue that μ as well as all of its ancestors have property (iii). For μ and its ancestors in $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mu}}$ this follows by induction. For μ^* and its ancestors this follows from the fact that the regions of each of these nodes contain the rectangle of $\mathcal{T}'_{\hat{\nu}}$ and \mathcal{T}_r , and the induction hypothesis on \mathcal{T}' .

Theorem 3 *Every properly weighted tree can be represented by an orthoconvex treemap in which all leaves are drawn as rectangles, L-shapes, or S-shapes, all internal nodes are drawn as orthoconvex polygons, and the aspect ratio of any of these regions is $O(1)$.*

3.2 Convex

We now describe a recursive algorithm for computing a polygonal partition (convex treemap) of aspect ratio $O(\text{depth}(\mathcal{T}))$ for a properly weighted tree \mathcal{T} . Our algorithm has two phases. We first convert \mathcal{T} into a binary tree \mathcal{T}^* and then construct a partition for \mathcal{T}^* . This two-phase approach is similar to the one taken by De Berg *et al.* [5], but we implement both phases differently.

Converting to a binary tree. We recursively convert \mathcal{T} into a binary tree \mathcal{T}^* , replacing each node with $k > 2$ children in \mathcal{T} by a binary subtree with $k - 1$ nodes. During this process we assign a label $d(\nu)$ to each node ν , which corresponds to the depth of ν in \mathcal{T} .

In a generic step, we treat a node ν with label $d(\nu)$, and our task is to convert the subtree rooted at ν . (Initially $\nu = \text{root}(\mathcal{T})$ with $d(\text{root}(\mathcal{T})) = 0$.) If ν is a leaf there is nothing to do. If ν has two children we recurse on these children and assign them label $d(\nu) + 1$. Otherwise ν has k children, $\text{children}(\nu) = \{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_k\}$, for some $k > 2$. We distinguish two cases, depending on their weight.

If there is a “heavy” child, say ν_1 , such that $\text{weight}(\nu_1) \geq \text{weight}(\nu)/2$, then we proceed as follows. We turn ν into a binary node whose children are ν_1 and a new node μ_1 ; the children of μ_1 are ν_2, \dots, ν_k . We recurse on ν_1 and on μ_1 , with $d(\nu_1) = d(\nu) + 1$ and $d(\mu_1) = d(\nu)$. Otherwise all children have weight less than $\text{weight}(\nu)/2$, and hence there is a partition of $\text{children}(\nu)$ into two subsets S_1 and S_2 such that $\text{weight}(S_i) \leq 2/3 \cdot \text{weight}(\nu)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. We turn ν into a binary node with children μ_1 and μ_2 , with children from S_1 and S_2 , respectively, and we recurse on μ_1 and μ_2 with $d(\mu_1) = d(\mu_2) = d(\nu)$.


Drawing a binary tree. Generalizing ϕ -separated polygons [5], we define a (k, ϕ) -polygon to be a convex polygon P such that

- (i) P does not have parallel edges, except possibly two horizontal edges and two vertical edges. Moreover, each non-axis-parallel edge e makes an angle of at least ϕ with any other edge and also with the x -axis and the y -axis.
- (ii) If P has two horizontal edges, then $\text{diam}(P)/\text{height}(P) \leq k$.
- (iii) If P has two vertical edges, then $\text{diam}(P)/\text{width}(P) \leq k$.

We observe that a (k, ϕ) -polygon P is a ϕ -separated polygon, if P has no parallel edges or if the smallest axis-parallel enclosing rectangle of P is a square.

Lemma 7 *Any (k, ϕ) -polygon has aspect ratio $O(\max(k, 1/\phi))$.*

Proof. Consider a (k, ϕ) -polygon P . For brevity, we write $w = \text{width}(P)$ and $h = \text{height}(P)$. Assume, without loss of generality, that $w \geq h$. Let e_1 and e_2 be the horizontal edges (possibly of length 0) and let $x = \min(|e_1|, |e_2|)$. Let X be the shaded parallelogram of width x . We distinguish three cases.



Case 1: $x > w/2$. P has two horizontal edges, so $h \geq \text{diam}(P)/k$. Clearly, the area of P is at least the area of X which is $xh > w \cdot \text{diam}(P)/(2k)$. The diameter of P is at most the diameter of the enclosing rectangle, hence $\text{diam}(P) \leq \sqrt{w^2 + h^2} \leq \sqrt{2}w$. Combined:

$$\text{asp}(P) = \frac{\text{diam}(P)^2}{\text{area}(P)} \leq \frac{2k \cdot \text{diam}(P)}{w} \leq 2\sqrt{2}k = O(k).$$


Case 2: $x \leq w/2$ and $w - x \leq h$. We know $h \geq w - x \geq w/2$, hence $w \leq 2h$. Therefore, $\text{diam}(P)^2 \leq h^2 + w^2 \leq 5h^2$. Let P' be the polygon obtained from P by reducing the length of e_1 and e_2 with $(w - h)$. Then, the bounding box of P' is square, hence P' is a ϕ -separated polygon, which has aspect ratio $O(1/\phi)$ [5]. Moreover, $\text{diam}(P') \geq h$ and $\text{area}(P) \geq \text{area}(P')$ hence

$$\text{asp}(P) = \frac{\text{diam}(P)^2}{\text{area}(P)} \leq \frac{5h^2}{\text{area}(P)} \leq 5 \cdot \frac{\text{diam}(P')^2}{\text{area}(P')} = 5 \cdot \text{asp}(P') = O(1/\phi).$$

Case 3: $x \leq w/2$ and $w - x > h$. Let Q be the polygon obtained by reducing the length of e_1 and e_2 with x . Clearly, $\text{area}(P) \leq \text{area}(Q)$. Moreover, $\text{diam}(P)^2 \leq 2w^2$ and $\text{diam}(Q)^2 \geq (w - x)^2 \geq w^2/4$. Then

$$\text{asp}(P) = \frac{\text{diam}(P)^2}{\text{area}(P)} \leq 2 \cdot \frac{w^2}{\text{area}(P)} \leq 8 \cdot \frac{w^2/4}{\text{area}(Q)} \leq 8 \cdot \text{asp}(Q).$$

Now, consider this polygon Q with width w' and height h . By construction, $w' = w - x > h$ and Q has at most one horizontal edge. Let e_3 and e_4 be the vertical edges (possibly of length 0) and let $y = \min(|e_3|, |e_4|)$. Let Q' be the polygon obtained from Q by reducing the length e_3 and e_4 with y . Note that Q' has no parallel edges and thus is a ϕ -separated polygon that has aspect ratio $O(1/\phi)$ [5]. Clearly, $\text{area}(Q) \geq \text{area}(Q')$. Moreover, $\text{diam}(Q)^2 \leq 2(w')^2$ and $\text{diam}(Q')^2 \geq (w')^2$. Then



$$\text{asp}(Q) = \frac{\text{diam}(Q)^2}{\text{area}(Q)} \leq 2 \cdot \frac{(w')^2}{\text{area}(Q)} \leq 2 \cdot \frac{\text{diam}(Q')^2}{\text{area}(Q')} = 2 \cdot \text{asp}(Q') = O(1/\phi).$$

Therefore, $\text{asp}(P) = O(1/\phi)$. □

We construct the partition for \mathcal{T}^* in a top-down manner. Suppose we arrive at a node ν in \mathcal{T}^* , with associated region $R(\nu)$; initially $\nu = \text{root}(\mathcal{T}^*)$ and $R(\nu)$ is the unit square. We write $n(\nu)$ for the number of non-axis-parallel edges in $R(\nu)$. We maintain the following invariants:

(Inv-1) $n(\nu) \leq d(\nu) + 4$;

(Inv-2) $R(\nu)$ is a $(k, \phi(\nu))$ -separated polygon for $k = \sqrt{17}$ and $\phi(\nu) = \pi/(2(d(\nu) + 6))$.

Note that the invariant is satisfied for $\nu = \text{root}(\mathcal{T}^*)$. Now consider a node ν that is not the root of \mathcal{T} . If ν is a leaf, there is nothing to do. Otherwise, let ν_1 and ν_2 be the two children of ν . Assume without loss of generality that $\text{weight}(\nu_1) \geq \text{weight}(\nu_2)$. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1: $d(\nu_1) = d(\nu) + 1$. Since $R(\nu)$ uses at most $d(\nu) + 4$ non-axis-parallel edges, there is a line ℓ that makes an angle of at least $\pi/(2(d(\nu) + 6))$ with each of the edges of $R(\nu)$ and with the x - and the y -axis. Imagine placing the line ℓ such that it splits $R(\nu)$ into two halves of equal area, and define R' to be the half with the smallest number of non-axis-parallel edges. Now partition $R(\nu)$ into subpolygons $R(\nu_1)$ and $R(\nu_2)$ of the appropriate area with a cut c that is parallel to ℓ such that $R(\nu_2) \subset R'$. (Thus c lies inside R' .) We claim that both $R(\nu_1)$ and $R(\nu_2)$ satisfy the invariant.

Clearly $R(\nu_1)$ uses at most one edge more than $R(\nu)$. Since $d(\nu_1) = d(\nu) + 1$, this implies that (Inv-1) is satisfied for $R(\nu_1)$. Now consider the number of non-axis-parallel edges of $R(\nu_2)$. This is

no more than the number of non-axis-parallel edges of R' . At most two non-axis-parallel edges are on both sides of ℓ , hence this number is bounded by

$$n(\nu_2) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n(\nu) + 2}{2} \right\rfloor + 1 \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d(\nu) + 6}{2} \right\rfloor + 1 = \left\lfloor \frac{d(\nu)}{2} \right\rfloor + 4 \leq d(\nu) + 4 \leq d(\nu_2) + 4.$$

Given the choice of ℓ , and because $d(\nu_i) \geq d(\nu)$ and $R(\nu)$ satisfies (Inv-2), we know that the minimum angle between any two non-parallel edges of $R(\nu_i)$ ($i \in \{1, 2\}$) is at least $\pi/(2(d(\nu_i) + 6))$. To show that $R(\nu_1)$ and $R(\nu_2)$ satisfy (Inv-2), it thus suffices to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 8 *If $R(\nu_i)$ has two horizontal edges, then $\text{diam}(R(\nu_i))/\text{height}(R(\nu_i)) \leq k$ and if $R(\nu_i)$ has two vertical edges, then $\text{diam}(R(\nu_i))/\text{width}(R(\nu_i)) \leq k$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.*

Proof. We prove only the first claim, the second proof is similar. Assume $R(\nu_i)$ has two horizontal edges e_1 and e_2 . Cut c is neither horizontal nor vertical, hence e_1 and e_2 show also up as (parts of) edges in $R(\nu)$. Hence, $\text{height}(R(\nu_i)) = \text{height}(R(\nu))$. Since $R(\nu_i) \subset R(\nu)$, we know $\text{diam}(R(\nu_i)) \leq \text{diam}(R(\nu))$. Thus $\text{diam}(R(\nu_i))/\text{height}(R(\nu_i)) \leq \text{diam}(R(\nu))/\text{height}(R(\nu)) \leq k$. \square

Case 2: $d(\nu_1) = d(\nu)$. By construction of \mathcal{T}^* , $1/3 \cdot \text{weight}(\nu) \leq \text{weight}(\nu_1) \leq 2/3 \cdot \text{weight}(\nu)$. We now partition $R(\nu)$ into two subpolygons of the appropriate area with an axis-parallel cut orthogonal to the longest side of the axis-parallel bounding box of $R(\nu)$. The possible positions of this cut are limited by convexity, as specified in the following lemma.

Lemma 9 *Let P be a convex polygon with $\text{width}(P) \geq \text{height}(P)$. We can partition P with a vertical cut into two subpolygons P_1, P_2 , where $\text{area}(P)/3 \leq \text{area}(P_i) \leq 2/3 \cdot \text{area}(P)$ (for $i \in \{1, 2\}$), such that $\text{width}(P)/4 \leq \text{width}(P_i) \leq 3/4 \cdot \text{width}(P)$.*

Clearly the number of non-axis-parallel edges of $R(\nu_1)$ and $R(\nu_2)$ is no more than the number of non-axis-parallel edges of $R(\nu)$. Since $d(\nu_i) \geq d(\nu)$, this implies $R(\nu_1)$ and $R(\nu_2)$ satisfy (Inv-1). As for (Inv-2), note that the cut does not introduce any new non-axis-parallel edges. It thus remains to prove the following lemma:

Lemma 10 *If $R(\nu_i)$ has two horizontal edges, then $\text{diam}(R(\nu_i))/\text{height}(R(\nu_i)) \leq \sqrt{17}$ (for $i \in \{1, 2\}$). Similarly, if $R(\nu_i)$ has two vertical edges, $\text{diam}(R(\nu_i))/\text{width}(R(\nu_i)) \leq \sqrt{17}$.*

Proof. We write h for $\text{height}(R(\nu))$, w for $\text{width}(R(\nu))$ and d for $\text{diam}(R(\nu))$ and define h_i , w_i and d_i similarly for $R(\nu_i)$. Assume, without loss of generality, that $w \geq h$, hence $R(\nu_i)$ is obtained from $R(\nu)$ by a vertical cut (and thus $h = h_i$). We distinguish two cases.

$w \leq 4h$: By Lemma 9 we know $h_i/4 \leq w_i \leq 3h_i$. Therefore:

$$d_i/w_i \leq \sqrt{h_i^2 + w_i^2}/w_i = \sqrt{(h_i/w_i)^2 + 1} \leq \sqrt{16 + 1} = \sqrt{17}$$

$w > 4h$: By Lemma 9 we know $w_i > h_i$. Therefore:

$$d_i/w_i \leq \sqrt{h_i^2 + w_i^2}/w_i = \sqrt{(h_i/w_i)^2 + 1} < \sqrt{1 + 1} = \sqrt{2}$$

If $R(\nu_i)$ has two horizontal edges, then so has $R(\nu)$, since no horizontal edges are introduced by the cut. Therefore $d/h \leq \sqrt{17}$. We know $h_i = h$ and obviously, $d_i \leq d$, hence $d_i/h_i \leq d/h \leq \sqrt{17}$. \square

Lemma 7, together with the fact that $\max_{\nu \in \mathcal{T}^*} d(\nu) = \text{depth}(\mathcal{T})$ and Inv-2, implies the result.

Theorem 4 *Every properly weighted tree of depth d can be represented by a polygonal partition (convex treemap) which has aspect ratio $O(d)$.*

References

- [1] M. Balzer and O. Deussen. Voronoi treemaps. In *Proc. IEEE Symposium on Information Visualization*, pages 7–14, 2005.
- [2] M. Balzer, O. Deussen, and C. Lewerentz. Voronoi treemaps for the visualization of software metrics. In *Proc. ACM Symposium on Software Visualization*, pages 165–172, 2005.
- [3] B. B. Bederson, B. Shneiderman, and M. Wattenberg. Ordered and quantum treemaps: Making effective use of 2d space to display hierarchies. *ACM Transactions on Graphics*, 21(4):833–854, 2002.
- [4] M. Bruls, K. Huizing, and J. van Wijk. Squarified treemaps. In *Proc. Joint Eurographics and IEEE TCVG Symposium on Visualization*, pages 33–42. Springer, 2000.
- [5] M. de Berg, K. Onak, and A. Sidiropoulos. Fat polygonal partitions with applications to visualization and embeddings. In preparation. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1009.1866v1>, 2010.
- [6] R. L. Graham. Bounds on multiprocessing timing anomalies. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 17:263–269, 1969.
- [7] L. Jin and D. C. Banks. Tennisviewer: A browser for competition trees. *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications*, 17(4):63–65, 1997.
- [8] W. Jungmeister and D. Turo. Adapting treemaps to stock portfolio visualization. Technical report UMCP-CSD CS-TR-2996, University of Maryland, 1992.
- [9] N. Kong, J. Heer, and M. Agrawala. Perceptual guidelines for creating rectangular treemaps. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 16(6):990–998, 2010.
- [10] J. Y.-T. Leung, T. W. Tam, C. Wong, G. H. Young, and F. Y. L. Chin. Packing squares into a square. *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, 10:271–275, 1990.
- [11] K. Onak and A. Sidiropoulos. Circular partitions with applications to visualization and embeddings. In *Proc. 24th Symposium on Computational Geometry*, pages 28–37, 2008.
- [12] B. Shneiderman. Treemaps for space-constrained visualization of hierarchies. <http://www.cs.umd.edu/hcil/treemap-history/index.shtml>.
- [13] B. Shneiderman. Tree visualization with tree-maps: 2-d space-filling approach. *ACM Transactions on Graphics*, 11(1):92–99, 1992.
- [14] E. Tufte. *The Visual Display of Quantitative Information*. Graphics Press, 2001.
- [15] D. Turo and B. Johnson. Improving the visualization of hierarchies with treemaps: Design issues and experimentation. 1992.
- [16] R. Vliegen, J. J. van Wijk, and E.-J. van der Linden. Visualizing business data with generalized treemaps. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 12(5):789–796, 2006.
- [17] M. Wattenberg. A note on space-filling visualizations and space-filling curves. In *Proc. IEEE Symposium on Information Visualization*, pages 181–185, 2005.

A Single-level treemaps

A.1 NP-hardness

In this section we prove that *tree mapping* is strongly NP-hard. Tree mapping is the problem of finding, for a given properly weighted single-level tree \mathcal{T} , a treemap such that A_{\max} is minimized and all regions R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n are rectangles. Our reduction is from *square packing* which was proven to be strongly NP-complete by Leung *et al.* [10]. Square packing is the problem of deciding for a given packing square S and a set of squares \mathcal{S} , each having integer side lengths, if there is an orthogonal (i.e. axis-aligned) packing of \mathcal{S} in S .

Assume that we are given a square packing instance SP: $(S, \mathcal{S} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_l\})$. We create a tree mapping instance TM: $\mathcal{T} = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\}$ with

$$n = l + \text{area}(S) - \sum_{i=1}^l \text{area}(s_i) \quad \text{and} \quad w_i = \begin{cases} \text{area}(s_i)/\text{area}(S) & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq l, \\ 1/\text{area}(S) & \text{if } l < i \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 11 *SP has a solution if and only if TM has aspect ratio 1.*

Proof. Assume that TM has aspect ratio 1. Then all weights are drawn as squares. Leaving out the lowest $n - l$ weights immediately gives a solution for SP. Now, assume that SP has a solution. Since all squares have integer side lengths, we can align all squares with the unit grid. The lowest $n - l$ weights of TM occupy exactly one grid cell each. Therefore, these can be drawn as squares as well and TM has aspect ratio 1. \square


Theorem 5 *Tree mapping is strongly NP-hard.*

Proof. By Lemma 11 we have a solution to a square packing instance iff we have a tree mapping solution of aspect ratio 1. Since square packing is strongly NP complete, we may assume that the size of S is polynomial in l . Then, n is polynomial in l as well. Therefore, the reduction can be done in polynomial time. \square

A.2 Lower bound orthoconvex

Consider a single-level tree $\mathcal{T} = \{w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4\}$, where $w_1 = w_2 = w_3 = x$ for some $x < 1/3$. As a result, $w_4 = 1 - 3x$. We are particularly interested in the cases where $x \approx 1/3$, that is, three regions are large and one is small. Then, we can make a few observations:

- If a region corresponding to any of the high weights touches two opposite sides of the container, its aspect ratio is $1/x$, since the container is the smallest enclosing square.
- We only allow L-shapes whose remainder is a rectangle, as shown in the top figure. The bottom two figures show L-shapes that are disallowed. Therefore, an allowed L-shape always touches all sides of the container C it is in. Consider such a subcontainer C and let \mathcal{T}' be the set of weights that are not drawn in C . Then, $|\mathcal{T}'| \leq 2$, since at least two weights are drawn in C . The entire container has four corners, so at least C or one of the weights in \mathcal{T}' touches two opposite sides of the container, by the pigeon hole principle.
- As a result of the previous two items, if we use an L-shape, at least one of the regions touches two opposite sides of the container and the aspect ratio is at least $1/x$. Hence, the only way of getting an aspect ratio better than $1/x$ is by not using L-shapes and with no rectangle touching two opposite sides of C . This drawing has aspect ratio $(1 - 2x)^2/(1 - 3x)$.



In order to find a worst-case optimal solution, we want to maximize the minimum of $1/x$ and $(1 - 2x)^2/(1 - 3x)$. That is, we solve the equation $1/x = (1 - 2x)^2/(1 - 3x)$, which gives aspect ratio $6/(2 + \sqrt[3]{3\sqrt{57} - 1} - \sqrt[3]{3\sqrt{57} + 1}) \approx 3.13$.

B Omitted proofs

Lemma 1 *Suppose all children of node ν have weight at most $t \cdot \text{weight}(\nu)$, for some $3/10 \leq t \leq 2/3$. Then we can partition $\text{children}(\nu)$ into two subsets H_1 and H_2 , such that*

$$\text{weight}(H_2) \leq \text{weight}(H_1) \leq \begin{cases} 2t \cdot \text{weight}(\nu) & \text{if } 3/10 \leq t < 1/3; \\ 2/3 \cdot \text{weight}(\nu) & \text{if } 1/3 \leq t \leq 2/3. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We partition the children using the *longest processing time* (LPT) algorithm [6]. The algorithm works as follows: given a list of weights $[w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n]$ in non-increasing order, and two bins H_1, H_2 , repetitively place the highest weight left in the bin with least total weight. Consider the last weight w^* put in bin H_1 . By LPT, H_1 was the emptiest bin before w^* was put in, hence $\text{weight}(H_1) - w^* \leq \text{weight}(H_2)$ and thus $\text{weight}(H_1) \leq (\text{weight}(\nu) + w^*)/2$.

If $1/3 \leq t \leq 2/3$, we distinguish two cases. If $1/2 \leq w_1/\text{weight}(\nu) \leq 2/3$, then it is clear that $\text{weight}(H_1) = w_1 \leq 2/3 \cdot \text{weight}(\nu)$. If $1/3 \leq w_1/\text{weight}(\nu) < 1/2$, then w_3 is the first weight that can cause $\text{weight}(H_1) \geq 1/2 \cdot \text{weight}(\nu)$. The weights are in non-increasing order, hence $w_i \leq \text{weight}(\nu)/i$. Therefore, $w^* \leq \text{weight}(\nu)/3$ and $\text{weight}(H_1) \leq 2/3 \cdot \text{weight}(\nu)$.

If $3/10 \leq t < 1/3$, we distinguish three cases. If $w_2 + w_3 \geq \text{weight}(\nu)/2$, then $H_1 = \{w_2, w_3\}$. It is not hard to see that H_1 has maximal weight if $w_3 = w_2 = w_1 = t$, hence $\text{weight}(H_1) \leq 2t \cdot \text{weight}(\nu)$. If $w_2 + w_3 < \text{weight}(\nu)/2$ but $w_1 + w_4 \geq \text{weight}(\nu)/2$, then $\text{weight}(H_1) < \text{weight}(\nu)/3 + \text{weight}(\nu)/4 = 7/12 \cdot \text{weight}(\nu) < 2t \cdot \text{weight}(\nu)$. If $w_2 + w_3 < \text{weight}(\nu)/2$ and $w_1 + w_4 < \text{weight}(\nu)/2$, then $w^* \leq \text{weight}(\nu)/5$, hence $\text{weight}(H_1) \leq 3/5 \cdot \text{weight}(\nu) \leq 2t \cdot \text{weight}(\nu)$. \square

Lemma 2 *Let R be a rectangle and $w_1 \geq w_2$ be weights such that $w_1 + w_2 = \text{area}(R)$. Then we can partition R into two subrectangles R_1, R_2 whose aspect ratios are at most $\max(\text{asp}(R), \text{area}(R)/w_2)$.*

Proof. R_i has aspect ratio $\max(w_i \cdot \text{asp}(R)/\text{area}(R), \text{area}(R)/(w_i \cdot \text{asp}(R)))$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. By assumption $w_1 \geq w_2$, hence the partitioning has aspect ratio $\max(w_1 \cdot \text{asp}(R)/\text{area}(R), \text{area}(R)/(w_2 \cdot \text{asp}(R)))$. We know $w_1/\text{area}(R) < 1$ and $\text{asp}(R) \geq 1$, which completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3 *For $A_I \geq (1 + \sqrt{5})/2 \approx 1.62$ and for all valid A_R , it holds that $A_{\max} \geq \frac{A^3}{A^2 - 1}$ implies $A_R/A_{\max} \leq 1 - 1/(A_R \cdot A_I)$.*

Proof. Rewriting $A_R/A_{\max} \leq 1 - 1/(A_R \cdot A_I)$, we obtain $A_R^2 - A_{\max} \cdot A_R + A_{\max}/A_I \leq 0$. This is a quadratic equation in A_R . This function evaluates to zero at $A_R^- = (A_{\max} - \sqrt{A_{\max}^2 - 4A_{\max}/A_I})/2$ and $A_R^+ = (A_{\max} + \sqrt{A_{\max}^2 - 4A_{\max}/A_I})/2$. Hence we know that the inequality is met in the interval $[A_R^-, A_R^+]$. We want the inequality to be met for all allowed values of A_R . Knowing that $1 \leq A_R \leq A_I$, we want $(A_{\max} - \sqrt{A_{\max}^2 - 4A_{\max}/A_I})/2 \leq 1$ and $(A_{\max} + \sqrt{A_{\max}^2 - 4A_{\max}/A_I})/2 \geq A_I$, which simplifies to $A_{\max} \geq A_I/(A_I - 1)$ and $A_{\max} \geq A_I^3/(A_I^2 - 1)$.

It can be shown that, for $A_I \geq (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$, $A_{\max} \geq A_I^3/(A_I^2 - 1) \Rightarrow A_{\max} \geq A_I/(A_I - 1)$, which concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 4 *For any orthogonal cut of a chisel C we have $\text{asp}(\text{base}) \leq \max\left(c \cdot \text{asp}(\rho(C)), 2/(\text{rel}_C(\text{base}) \cdot (2 \cdot \text{asp}(\rho(C)) - 1))\right)$, where $c = \text{rel}_C(\text{base})$ for a rectangular base and $c = 1$ for a pentagon.*

Proof. First, suppose that the width of the base is at least its height. The base is either a rectangle or a pentagon. Consider a rectangle, pentagon and chisel of the same height and width. Since the

areas are subsets/supersets, the aspect ratios are related as $A_{\text{rectangle}} < A_{\text{pentagon}} < A_{\text{chisel}}$. We know that the aspect ratio of a chisel decreases with the aspect ratio of its enclosing rectangle. Therefore, a chisel base would have aspect ratio at most $\text{asp}(\rho(C))$. The aspect ratio of a pentagon base is even lower.

If the base is a rectangle, we must prove a stronger bound. The width of the base is less than $\text{rel}_C(\text{base})$ times the width of the chisel, since most of chisel's area is in the base part. Therefore, the base has aspect ratio at most $\text{rel}_C(\text{base}) \cdot \text{asp}(\rho(C))$.

Now, let the width of the base be less than its height. Then, the smallest axis-aligned square of the base has area h^2 . Therefore, $A_{\text{base}} = h^2 / (\text{rel}_C(\text{base}) \cdot (hw - h^2/2)) = 2 / (\text{rel}_C(\text{base}) \cdot (2 \cdot \text{asp}(\rho(C)) - 1))$. \square

Lemma 5 *For any parallel cut of a chisel C we have $\text{asp}(\text{short}) \leq \text{asp}(\text{long})$ if and only if $\text{rel}_C(\text{long}) \leq \text{asp}(\rho(C)) / (2 \cdot \text{asp}(\rho(C)) - 1)$.*


Proof. Assume that $\text{width}(C) \geq \text{height}(C)$. Let $x = \text{height}(\text{long}) / \text{height}(C)$. By some simple calculations, we can show $x = \text{asp}(\rho(C)) - \sqrt{\text{asp}(\rho(C))^2 + \text{rel}_C(\text{base}) \cdot (2 \cdot \text{asp}(\rho(C)) - 1)}$, using that $0 < x < 1$ and $\text{asp}(\rho(C)) > 1$.

Let $x^* = \text{height}(\text{long}^*) / \text{height}(C)$ where long^* and short^* are defined such that these are similar, that is, $\text{width}(\text{long}^*) / \text{height}(\text{long}^*) = \text{width}(\text{short}^*) / \text{height}(\text{short}^*)$. Again, some simple calculations lead to $x^* = \text{asp}(\rho(C)) - \sqrt{\text{asp}(\rho(C))(\text{asp}(\rho(C)) - 1)}$, using that $0 < x^* < 1$ and $\text{asp}(\rho(C)) > 1$.

Solving $x \leq x^*$ leads to the expression given. \square

Lemma 9 *Let P be a convex polygon with $\text{width}(P) \geq \text{height}(P)$. We can partition P with a vertical cut into two subpolygons P_1, P_2 , where $\text{area}(P)/3 \leq \text{area}(P_i) \leq 2/3 \cdot \text{area}(P)$ (for $i \in \{1, 2\}$), such that $\text{width}(P)/4 \leq \text{width}(P_i) \leq 3/4 \cdot \text{width}(P)$.*

Proof. Assume, without loss of generality, that $\text{area}(P) = 1$. We cut the axis-parallel smallest enclosing rectangle of P into three vertical slices l , c and r of relative widths $1/4$, $1/2$ and $1/4$, respectively. Let P_x be the intersection of P with slice $x \in \{l, c, r\}$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\text{area}(P_l) \geq \text{area}(P_r)$. The lemma then follows from $\text{area}(P_l) \leq 1/2$ and $\text{area}(P_r) \leq 1/3$, since we can always let the left subpolygon be the larger. It is not hard to see that the relative area of P_l is maximal if P is a triangle and the relative area of P_r is maximal if P is a rectangle, as shown. In the first case, $\text{area}(P_l) = 7/16 < 1/2$. In the latter, $\text{area}(P_r) = 1/4 < 1/3$. \square



C Experimental results

We implemented our drawing algorithms and performed a small set of experiments. As input we used synthetic data constructed randomly. Specifically, for the single-level trees we first select a number n between 1 and 100 uniformly at random. The tree then consists of n weights, where weight i is a number between 1 and i chosen uniformly at random. That is, low weights are more likely than high ones. For the hierarchical trees we prescribe a maximal depth d . Each node at depth less than d becomes a leaf with probability $1/4$, all nodes at depth d are automatically leaves. Each internal nodes has 2 to 4 children, uniformly at random. Each leaf has a value between 1 and k , uniformly at random, where k is the index of the leaf in an in-order traversal of the tree. We measured both the maximum and the average aspect ratio per treemap, averaged over 10 test runs (see Table 1). For convex hierarchies, we measured the aspect ratio for trees of various depths. For orthoconvex hierarchies, we noticed no significant influence of the depth of the input tree on the aspect ratio, as expected. Fig. 3 shows four representative treemaps.





Fig. 3: Treemaps constructed by our drawing algorithms for typical generated input: single-level orthoconvex, single-level convex, hierarchical orthoconvex, hierarchical convex.

The experiments show that all methods remain significantly below their provable worst case aspect ratios. Especially the algorithm for orthoconvex treemaps does significantly better in practice. A likely explanation is that the cases that cause the comparatively high aspect ratio bound in our proof do occur only rarely and were therefore not generated as input during our limited experiments. We carefully constructed a tree that exhibits all four cases as described in Section 3.1. The corresponding treemap is shown on the right. We used a variant of *nesting* [15], combined with shading according to the depth of a subtree, to emphasize the tree structure.



Method	Depth	Maximum	Average
Ortho-convex single-level	-	2.68	1.58
Convex single-level	-	3.46	1.76
Ortho-convex hierarchy	-	7.86	1.83
Convex hierarchy	1	3.40	2.72
	2	4.36	2.91
	3	5.86	3.24
	4	7.71	3.75
	5	7.82	3.65
	6	9.00	3.84
	7	9.52	3.81
	8	10.2	3.83

Table 1: Maximum and average aspect ratio, averaged over 10 test runs.

