

Fine-Grained Complexity of Earth Mover’s Distance under Translation*

Karl Bringmann[†] Frank Staals[‡] Karol Węgrzycki[§] Geert van Wordragen[¶]

Abstract

The Earth Mover’s Distance is a popular similarity measure in several branches of computer science. It measures the minimum total edge length of a perfect matching between two point sets. The Earth Mover’s Distance under Translation (EMDuT) is a translation-invariant version thereof. It minimizes the Earth Mover’s Distance over all translations of one point set.

For EMDuT in \mathbb{R}^1 , we present an $\tilde{O}(n^2)$ -time algorithm. We also show that this algorithm is nearly optimal by presenting a matching conditional lower bound based on the Orthogonal Vectors Hypothesis. For EMDuT in \mathbb{R}^d , we present an $\tilde{O}(n^{2d+2})$ -time algorithm for the L_1 and L_∞ metric. We show that this dependence on d is asymptotically tight, as an $n^{o(d)}$ -time algorithm for L_1 or L_∞ would contradict the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH). Prior to our work, only approximation algorithms were known for these problems.

*This work was initiated at the Workshop on New Directions in Geometric Algorithms, May 14-19 2023, Utrecht, The Netherlands.

[†]Saarland University and Max-Planck-Institute for Informatics, Saarland Informatics Campus, Saarbrücken, Germany, bringmann@cs.uni-saarland.de. This work is part of the project TIPEA that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Unions Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 850979).

[‡]Department of Information and Computing Sciences, Utrecht University, The Netherlands, f.staals@uu.nl

[§]Saarland University and Max Planck Institute for Informatics, Saarland Informatics Campus, Saarbrücken, Germany, wegrzycki@cs.uni-saarland.de. This work is part of the project TIPEA that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 850979).

[¶]Department of Computer Science, Aalto University, Espoo, Finland, Geert.vanWordragen@aalto.fi



European Research Council
Established by the European Commission



1 Introduction

Earth Mover’s Distance (EMD). EMD, also known as geometric transportation or geometric bipartite matching, is a widely studied distance measure (see, e.g., [1, 3, 6–8, 25, 26, 30, 32, 40]) that has received significant interest in computer vision, starting with the work of [42]. Depending on the precise formulation, EMD is a distance measure on point sets, distributions, or functions. In this paper, we study the following formulation of EMD as measuring the distance from a set of blue points B to a set of red points R :

$$\text{EMD}_p(B, R) = \min_{\text{injective } \phi: B \rightarrow R} \sum_{b \in B} \|b - \phi(b)\|_p.$$

Here, the minimization goes over all injective functions from B to R , i.e., ϕ encodes a perfect matching of the points in B to points in R , and the cost of a matching is the total length of all matching edges, with respect to the L_p metric, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. When the value of p is irrelevant, we may drop the subscript p .

The EMD_p problem is to compute the value $\text{EMD}_p(B, R)$ for given sets $B, R \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ of sizes $|B| \leq |R| = n$. This general problem is sometimes called the *asymmetric* EMD. The *symmetric* EMD is the special case with the additional restriction $|B| = |R|$. Intuitively, the asymmetric EMD asks whether B is similar to some subset of R , while the symmetric variant compares the full sets B and R . In this paper, we assume the dimension d to be constant.

We briefly discuss algorithms for EMD. Note that EMD can be formulated as a mincost matching problem on a bipartite graph with vertices $R \cup B$, where edge lengths are equal to the point-to-point distances. This graph has $|R| \cdot |B| = \mathcal{O}(n^2)$ edges and solving bipartite mincost matching by the Hungarian method yields an exact algorithm for EMD with running time $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$. Alternatively, by combining geometric spanners with recent advancements in (approximate) mincost flow solvers, one can obtain fast approximation algorithms for EMD. For instance, symmetric EMD in L_2 metric can be solved in time $n(\log(n)/\varepsilon)^{\mathcal{O}(d)}$ [32]. See also [1, 3, 8, 25, 26, 30] for more approximation algorithms. Conditional lower bounds are also known, but they apply only when the dimension is super-constant [40].

Earth Mover’s Distance under Translation (EMDuT). We study a variant of EMD that is invariant under translations, and thus compares shapes of point sets, ignoring their absolute positions:

$$\text{EMDuT}_p(B, R) = \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d} \text{EMD}_p(B + \tau, R).$$

Here, $B + \tau = \{b + \tau \mid b \in B\}$ is the translated point set. See Figure 1.1 for an illustration of this distance measure. Again, we call asymmetric EMDuT_p the problem of computing $\text{EMDuT}_p(B, R)$ for given sets B, R of size $|B| \leq |R| = n$, and the symmetric variant comes with the additional restriction $|B| = |R|$. This measure was introduced by Cohen and Guibas [19], who presented heuristics as well as an exact algorithm with respect to the squared Euclidean distance. Later, Klein and Veltkamp [33] designed a 2-approximation algorithm for symmetric EMDuT_p running in asymptotically the same time as any EMD algorithm. Cabello, Giannopoulos, Knauer, and Rote [14] designed $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithms for EMDuT_2 in the plane, running in time $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^4/\varepsilon^4)$ for the asymmetric variant and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^{3/2}/\varepsilon^{7/2})$ for the symmetric variant.¹ Eppstein et al. [23] proposed algorithms to solve the symmetric EMDuT_1 and symmetric EMDuT_∞ problems in the plane, that run in $\mathcal{O}(n^6 \log^3 n)$ time. We remark that most of these works also study variants of EMDuT under more general transformations than translations, but in this paper we focus on translations.

We are not aware of any other research on EMDuT , which is surprising, since translation-invariant distance measures are well motivated, and the analogous Hausdorff distance under translation [2, 13, 16, 27, 28, 34, 35, 41] and Fréchet distance under translation [4, 9, 11, 12, 24, 31, 37] have received considerably more attention.

¹Here and throughout the paper we use $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ notation to ignore logarithmic factors, i.e., $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T) = \bigcup_{c \geq 0} \mathcal{O}(T(\log T)^c)$.




Figure 1.1: Given a set of (solid) blue points B and a set of red points R , our goal is to find a translation τ (shown in green) and a perfect matching from $B + \tau$ to R (shown in black) that minimizes the total distance of matched pairs.

1.1 Our results

We study EMDuT from the perspective of fine-grained complexity. We design new algorithms and prove conditional lower bounds over \mathbb{R}^1 , as well as for L_1 and L_∞ over \mathbb{R}^d .

EMDuT in 1D. Over \mathbb{R}^1 all L_p metrics are equal. We present the following new algorithms.

Theorem 1.1 (1D Algorithms). *(Symmetric:) Given sets $B, R \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ of size $n = |B| = |R|$, $\text{EMDuT}(B, R)$ can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$. (Asymmetric:) Given sets $B, R \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ of size $m = |B| \leq n = |R|$, $\text{EMDuT}(B, R)$ can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(mn(\log n + \log^2 m))$.*

Note that for $m = \Omega(n)$, for the asymmetric variant we obtain near-quadratic time $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^2)$, while for the symmetric variant we obtain near-linear time $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$. We fully explain this gap, by proving a matching conditional lower bound showing that no algorithm solves the asymmetric variant in strongly subquadratic time $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\delta})$ for any $\delta > 0$, for $m = \Omega(n)$. In fact, we present a stronger lower bound that even rules out fast approximation algorithms, not only fast exact algorithms. Our lower bound assumes the Orthogonal Vectors Hypothesis (OVH), a widely-accepted conjecture from fine-grained complexity theory; for a definition see Section 4.

Theorem 1.2 (1D Lower Bound). *Assuming OVH, for any constant $\delta > 0$ there is no algorithm that, given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and sets $B, R \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ of size $n = |R| \geq |B| = \Omega(n)$, computes a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation of $\text{EMDuT}(B, R)$ in time $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\delta}/\varepsilon^{o(1)})$.*

As a corollary, the same conditional lower bound holds for EMDuT_p over \mathbb{R}^d , for any $d \geq 1$ and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, since subsets of \mathbb{R} can be embedded into \mathbb{R}^d for any dimension d and any L_p metric.

Let us give a brief overview of these results. In the symmetric setting, we establish that $f(\tau) := \text{EMD}(B + \tau, R)$ is a unimodal function in τ , i.e., it is first monotone decreasing and then monotone increasing, and thus its minimum can be found easily. In contrast, in the asymmetric setting the function $f(\tau)$ can have up to $\Theta(n^2)$ disconnected global minima. Intuitively, our lower bound shows that any algorithm needs to consider each one of these global near-minima, and therefore the running time must be quadratic in order to determine which near-minimum is the actual global minimum. To obtain our algorithm in the asymmetric setting, we use a sweep algorithm with an intricate event handling data structure.

EMDuT for L_1 and L_∞ metric in higher dimensions. We extend the work of Eppstein et al. [23] for point sets in \mathbb{R}^d , leading to the following algorithms.

Theorem 1.3 (Algorithms for L_1 and L_∞ metric, Asymmetric). *Given sets $B, R \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ of size $m = |B| \leq n = |R|$, $\text{EMDuT}_1(B, R)$ and $\text{EMDuT}_\infty(B, R)$ can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(m^d n^{d+2} \log^{d+2} n)$.*

We explain that such a dependence on dimension is unavoidable, by establishing a more coarse-grained lower bound compared to our 1D results: We show that no algorithm can solve the problem in time $n^{o(d)}$. In fact, we present a stronger lower bound that even rules out fast approximation algorithms. Our lower bound assumes the Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH) [29], which is a well-established conjecture from fine-grained complexity theory.

Theorem 1.4 (Lower Bound for L_1 and L_∞ metric, Symmetric). *Assuming ETH, there is no algorithm that, given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and sets $B, R \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ of size $n = |B| = |R|$, computes a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation of $\text{EMDuT}_1(B, R)$ in time $(\frac{n}{\varepsilon})^{o(d)}$. The same holds for $\text{EMDuT}_\infty(B, R)$.*

Note that our lower bound pertains to the symmetric setting, while our algorithm addresses the more general asymmetric setting. Hence, these results together cover both the symmetric and the asymmetric setting.

Let us give a brief overview of these results. For the algorithm, we establish an arrangement of complexity $\mathcal{O}(m^d n^d)$ such that the optimal translation τ is attained at one of the vertices within this arrangement. Our algorithm is obtained by computing the EMD at each vertex. The lower bound is proven via a reduction from the k -Clique problem. In our construction, each coordinate of the translation τ chooses one vertex from a given k -Clique instance. We design gadgets that verify that every pair of selected nodes indeed forms an edge.

1.2 Open problems

EMDuT in 1D. Over \mathbb{R}^1 , we leave open whether there are fast approximation algorithms: Can a constant-factor approximation be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\delta})$ for some constant $\delta > 0$? Or even in time $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$? Can a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation be computed in time $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^{2-\delta}/\text{poly}(\varepsilon))$ for some constant $\delta > 0$ (independent of n and ε)? Or even in time $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n/\text{poly}(\varepsilon))$?

EMDuT for L_1 and L_∞ metric in higher dimensions. For the L_1 and L_∞ metric in dimension $d \geq 2$ we leave open to determine the optimal constant $c > 0$ such that the problem can be solved in time $n^{c \cdot d + o(d)}$.

EMDuT for L_2 metric in higher dimensions. The L_2 metric is the most natural measure in the geometric settings, making EMDuT_2 a well motivated problem. The most pressing open problem is to determine the complexity of the EMDuT_2 problem in any dimension $d \geq 2$.

It is known that the EMDuT_2 problem cannot be solved exactly. Namely, for any point set $R \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of size n , if B consists of n copies of the point $(0, \dots, 0)$, then $\text{EMDuT}_2(B, R)$ is the (cost of the) Geometric Median of R . Because the Geometric Median has no exact algebraic expression (even for $d = 2$) [10], there is no exact algorithm for EMDuT_2 in dimension $d \geq 2$.

We therefore need to relax the goal and ask for an approximation algorithm. Geometric Median has a very fast $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm running in time $\mathcal{O}(nd \log^3(1/\varepsilon))$ [18], so the reduction from Geometric Median to EMDuT_2 does not rule out very fast approximation algorithms for EMDuT_2 .

This is in stark contrast to what we know about the EMDuT_2 problem, as almost all of our techniques in this paper completely fail for this problem. We neither obtain an algorithm running in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(d)}$, nor can we prove a lower bound ruling out time $n^{o(d)}$. On the lower bound side, all we know is the lower bound from 1D, ruling out $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithms running in time $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\delta}/\varepsilon^{o(1)})$ for any constant $\delta > 0$. On the algorithms side, one can observe that after fixing the matching from B to R , the problem of finding the optimal translation τ for this matching is the Geometric Median problem and thus has a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm running in time $\mathcal{O}(nd \log^3(1/\varepsilon))$. By trying out all $n^{\mathcal{O}(n)}$ possible matchings, one can obtain a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for EMDuT_2 running in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(n)} \log^3(1/\varepsilon)$ for any constant d . We pose as an open problem to close this huge gap between the quadratic lower and exponential upper bound (for $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithms with a $1/\varepsilon^{o(1)}$ dependency on ε in the running time).

2 Preliminaries

We use $[n]$ to denote $\{1, \dots, n\}$. All logarithms are base 2. For every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we let $\lfloor x \rfloor \in \mathbb{Z}$ be the unique integer such that $x - \lfloor x \rfloor \in (-1/2, 1/2]$. Consider a set of blue points $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and a set of red points $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Fix an L_p norm, for any $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Denote by Φ the set of all injective functions $\phi: B \rightarrow R$, i.e., Φ is the set of all perfect matchings from B to R . For any matching $\phi \in \Phi$ and any translation $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we define the cost

$$\mathcal{D}_{B,R,p}(\phi, \tau) = \sum_{b \in B} \|b + \tau - \phi(b)\|_p.$$

We will ignore the subscript p when it is clear from the context. Note that we can express EMD and EMDuT in terms of this cost function as

$$\text{EMD}_p(B, R) = \min_{\phi \in \Phi} \mathcal{D}_{B,R,p}(\phi, (0, \dots, 0)) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{EMDuT}_p(B, R) = \min_{\phi \in \Phi} \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{D}_{B,R,p}(\phi, \tau).$$

3 Algorithm in one dimension

We first consider computing $\text{EMDuT}_p(B, R)$ for two point sets B, R in \mathbb{R}^1 . For ease of presentation, assume that R and B are indeed sets, and thus there are no duplicate points. We can handle the case of duplicate points by symbolic perturbation. Observe, that the distance between a pair of points b, r in any L_p metric is simply $\|b - r\|_p = \|b - r\|_1 = |b - r|$. In Section 3.1, we describe a very simple $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time algorithm to compute $\text{EMDuT}_p(B, R)$ (as well as an optimal matching ϕ^* and translation τ^* that realize this distance) when B and R both contain exactly n points. In Section 3.2, we consider the much more challenging case where $|B| = m$ and $|R| = n$ differ. For this case we develop an $\mathcal{O}(nm(\log n + \log^2 m))$ time algorithm to compute $\text{EMDuT}_p(B, R)$.

A matching ϕ is said to be *monotonically increasing* if and only if for every pair of blue points $b' < b$ we also have $\phi(b') < \phi(b)$. We show the following crucial property.

Lemma 3.1. *When $B, R \subset \mathbb{R}$ there is an optimal matching ϕ that is monotonically increasing.*

Proof. Assume we have an optimal matching ϕ where $\phi(b) = r'$ and $\phi(b') = r$ for $b > b'$ and $r > r'$. Then, define a modified matching $\tilde{\phi}$ that has $\tilde{\phi}(b) = r$ and $\tilde{\phi}(b') = r'$, and everywhere else is the same as ϕ . Without loss of generality, assume $b \geq r$. Then, $|b - r'| + |b' - r| = |b - r| + |r - r'| + |b' - r| > |b - r| + |b' - r'|$ which means $\mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\phi, 0) > \mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\tilde{\phi}, 0)$. Thus, we can modify the matching until it is monotonically increasing. \square

3.1 Symmetric case

In the symmetric case ($|R| = |B|$), Lemma 3.1 uniquely defines an optimal matching. Let $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ and $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$ be the points in increasing order. Now, the optimal translation τ^* is the value for τ that minimizes $\mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\phi, \tau) = \sum_{i=1}^n |b_i - r_i + \tau|$. Thus, it corresponds to the median of $b_1 - r_1, \dots, b_n - r_n$, which we can compute in $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time.

Theorem 3.2. *We can compute $\text{EMDuT}(R, B)$ in 1D in $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time when $|R| = |B|$.*

3.2 Asymmetric case

In this section, we present an $\mathcal{O}(mn(\log n + \log^2 m))$ time algorithm to compute $\text{EMDuT}(B, R)$, for the case that $m \leq n$. Consider the cost $f(\tau) = \min_{\phi \in \Phi} \mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\phi, \tau)$ as a function of τ . The minimum of this function is $\text{EMDuT}(B, R)$. The main idea is then to sweep over the domain of f , increasing τ from $-\infty$ to ∞ , while maintaining (a representation of) f and a matching ϕ that realizes cost $f(\tau) = \mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\phi, \tau)$. We also maintain the best translation $\tau^* \leq \tau$ (i.e. with minimal cost) among the translations considered so far (and if there are multiple such translations, the smallest one), so at the end of our sweep, τ^* is thus an optimal translation.




Figure 3.1: Schematic representation of the graph $G = \phi \otimes \phi'$ used in the proof of Lemma 3.3. Each edge exists if and only if exactly one edge from either ϕ or ϕ' is present. Green edges arise from the matching ϕ' , while yellow edges arise from the matching ϕ .




Figure 3.2: Case when connected component of G is a cycle.

Properties of f . By Lemma 3.1, for any τ , there exists an optimal monotonically increasing matching between $B + \tau$ and R . So, we restrict our attention to such monotonically increasing matchings. Observe that any such matching ϕ corresponds to a partition of B into *runs*, i.e. maximal subsequences of consecutive points, B_1, \dots, B_z , so that the points b_{t-k}, \dots, b_t in a run B_i are matched to consecutive red points r_{u-k}, \dots, r_u , for some $r_u = \phi(b_t)$. Moreover, for any such a matching ϕ , the function $\mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\phi, \tau)$ is piecewise linear in τ , and each breakpoint is a translation τ for which there is a pair $(b, r) \in B \times R$ with $b + \tau = r$. It then follows that $f(\tau)$ is also piecewise linear in τ . Furthermore, the breakpoints of f are of two types. A type (i) breakpoint is a translation such that there is a pair $(b, r) \in B \times R$ with $b + \tau = r$, and a type (ii) breakpoint if there are two different matchings ϕ, ϕ' that both realize the same minimum cost $\mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\phi, \tau) = \mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\phi', \tau)$. We show the following key lemma, which lets us characterize the breakpoints of type (ii) more precisely.

Lemma 3.3. *Let ϕ be an optimal monotone matching of $\text{EMD}_p(B + \tau, R)$, and let ϕ' be an optimal monotone matching of $\text{EMD}_p(B + \tau', R)$ for some $\tau' > \tau$. Then, $\phi'(b) \geq \phi(b)$ for all $b \in B$.*

Proof. We assume that all the points are distinct, as otherwise we can perturb them infinitesimally to resolve ties. Consider a bipartite graph G defined as follows: the vertices of G are $B \uplus R$, and we add an edge $(b, r) \in B \times R$ to G if exactly one of the following conditions holds: (i) $\phi(b) = r$ and $\phi'(b) \neq r$, or (ii) $\phi'(b) = r$ and $\phi(b) \neq r$. The graph G can be thought of as the exclusive-or of the matchings ϕ and ϕ' , see Figure 3.1. We will now demonstrate that the connected components of this graph are paths. Then, considering that the matchings are monotone, it follows that the edges of these paths are non-crossing. This implies that consecutive red vertices on these paths are monotone. Hence, if we translate to the right, the matching ϕ' is superior to ϕ .

Let C be any connected component of G that consists of more than one vertex.

Claim 3.4. *C is a path.*

Proof. Observe that the maximum degree of graph G is 2, so the connected components of G consist of cycles and paths. Assume that C is a cycle. In that case, however, there exists a pair of edges from either ϕ or ϕ' that intersect (see Figure 3.2). This contradicts the assumption about the monotonicity of both ϕ and ϕ' . Hence, C is not a cycle, and the proof of the claim follows. \square

Now we know that C is a path. Let $\{p_1, \dots, p_\ell\} = V(C)$ be the consecutive vertices on the path C . We have the freedom to select the order of endpoints; hence, without loss of generality, assume that p_1 is on the left of p_ℓ , i.e., $p_1 < p_\ell$.




Figure 3.3: Two cases of Claim 3.6 in which the crossing occurs.

Claim 3.5. *Vertices p_1 and p_ℓ are in R .*

Proof. Assume that p_1 is in B (the proof for p_ℓ is analogous). If $\phi(b') = \phi(b)$, then the vertex p_1 is isolated in G . If $\phi(b') \neq \phi(b)$, then the degree of p_1 is 2. Hence, p_1 cannot have a degree 1. \square

Since G is a bipartite graph, this means that ℓ is odd. We assumed that $|V(C)| > 1$, so $\ell \geq 3$. Observe that if i is odd, then $p_i \in R$, and if i is even, then $p_i \in B$. Now, we show that red and blue vertices in C are monotone:

Claim 3.6. *For every $i \in [\ell - 2]$, it holds that $p_i < p_{i+2}$.*

Proof. When $\ell = 3$, the claim holds because we have assumed $p_1 < p_3$. Hence, we can assume that $\ell \geq 5$ (since ℓ is odd). For the sake of contradiction, assume that $p_i > p_{i+2}$ for some i . Let $t_i := p_{i+2} - p_i$ for $i \in [\ell - 2]$. This means that there exists $i \in [\ell - 2]$ with $t_i < 0$. Moreover, we have $p_\ell > p_1$, which means that $\sum_{\text{odd } i} t_i > 0$. Therefore, there also exists $j \in [\ell - 2]$ with $t_j > 0$.

In particular, there exists an index $k \in [\ell - 2]$ such that $t_k \cdot t_{k+1} < 0$. This means that either (a) $p_k > p_{k+2}$ and $p_{k+1} < p_{k+3}$, or (b) $p_k < p_{k+2}$ and $p_{k+1} > p_{k+3}$. In both of these cases, the intervals (p_k, p_{k+1}) and (p_{k+2}, p_{k+3}) intersect (see Figure 3.3), which contradicts the assumption about the monotonicity of ϕ and ϕ' . \square

Now, we continue the proof of Lemma 3.3. For the sake of contradiction, assume that $\phi'(b) < \phi(b)$ for some $b \in B$. By Claim 3.6, it actually means that $\phi'(b) < \phi(b)$ for every $b \in B$. Recall that the cost of matching ϕ is:

$$\mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\phi, \tau) = \sum_{b \in B} |b + \tau - \phi(b)|.$$

Since ϕ and ϕ' are optimal matchings for τ and τ' respectively, we have:

$$\mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\phi, \tau) < \mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\phi', \tau) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\phi', \tau') < \mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\phi, \tau').$$

Next, we add these inequalities:

$$\mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\phi, \tau) + \mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\phi', \tau') < \mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\phi', \tau) + \mathcal{D}_{B,R}(\phi, \tau').$$

Next, we invoke the definition of $\mathcal{D}_{B,R}$ and have:

$$\sum_{b \in B} |b + \tau - \phi(b)| + |b + \tau' - \phi'(b)| < \sum_{b \in B} |b + \tau - \phi'(b)| + |b + \tau' - \phi(b)|.$$

This, in particular, means:

$$0 < \sum_{b \in B} |b + \tau - \phi'(b)| + |b + \tau' - \phi(b)| - |b + \tau - \phi(b)| - |b + \tau' - \phi'(b)|. \quad (3.1)$$

We will show that this inequality is false for every term of this sum and derive a contradiction with the assumption that $\phi'(b) < \phi(b)$. To that end, fix a term $b \in B$ and let $x := b + \tau - \phi(b)$, $c_1 := \tau' - \tau$, and $c_2 := \phi(b) - \phi'(b)$. Observe, that for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$, when $c_1, c_2 > 0$:

$$0 \geq |x + c_2| + |x + c_1| - |x| - |x + c_1 + c_2|.$$

This holds by case analysis on x . Therefore, each term of (3.1) has an opposite sign. Hence, (3.1) is false and we arrive at the contradiction. \square

Corollary 3.7. *A breakpoint τ of type (ii) corresponds to a pair of monotonically increasing matchings ϕ, ϕ' for which for all points $b \in B$ we have $\phi(b) \leq \phi'(b)$. Furthermore, consider a run b_s, \dots, b_t of ϕ and a point b_i with $i \in \{s, \dots, t\}$. If $\phi(b_i) < \phi'(b_i)$, then $\phi(b_j) < \phi'(b_j)$ for all $j \in \{i, \dots, t\}$.*

Lemma 3.8. *The function $f(\tau)$ is piecewise linear, and consists of $\mathcal{O}(nm)$ pieces.*

Proof. As argued above, f is piecewise linear. What remains is to argue that there are $\mathcal{O}(nm)$ breakpoints. For every pair of points $(b_i, r_j) \in B \times R$ there is only one translation τ such that $b + \tau = r$, so clearly there are at most $\mathcal{O}(nm)$ breakpoints of type (i). At every breakpoint of type (ii), there is at least one blue point b_i that was matched to r_j and gets matched to some r_k with $k > j$. This also happens at most once for every pair b_i, r_j . Hence, the number of breakpoints of type (ii) is also $\mathcal{O}(nm)$. \square

In our sweep line algorithm we will maintain a current optimal matching ϕ . At each breakpoint of type (i) we will have an event to update the cost function of the matching. Furthermore, it follows from Corollary 3.7 that when we sweep over a breakpoint of type (ii), we can decompose the changes to the matching using a series of *atomic* events. In each such atomic event there is some suffix b_j, \dots, b_t of a run b_s, \dots, b_t that ϕ currently matches to r_{u-j}, \dots, r_u that will become matched to $r_{u-j+1}, \dots, r_{u+1}$. As we argued in the proof of Lemma 3.8, the total number of such events is only $\mathcal{O}(nm)$. Next, we express how we can efficiently compute the next such atomic event, and handle it.

Consider a run $B_i = b_s, \dots, b_t$ induced by ϕ at time τ . Our aim is to find the smallest $\tau' \geq \tau$ at which there is an atomic type (ii) event involving a suffix b_j, \dots, b_t of B_i . Hence, for a given suffix b_j, \dots, b_t , we wish to maintain when it starts being beneficial to match b_j, \dots, b_t to $r_{u-j+1}, \dots, r_{u+1}$ rather than to r_{u-j}, \dots, r_u .

Let Δ'_j represent the change in cost when we match $b = b_j$ to $r' = r_{v+1}$ rather than to $r = r_v$, ignoring that r_{v+1} may already be matched to some other blue point. We have that

$$\Delta'_j(\tau) = |b - r' + \tau| - |b - r + \tau| = \begin{cases} r' - r & \text{if } b + \tau \leq r, \\ r + r' - 2b - 2\tau & \text{if } r < b + \tau < r', \\ r - r' & \text{if } b + \tau \geq r'. \end{cases}$$

Observe that this function is piecewise linear, and decreasing (more precisely, non-increasing). Moreover, the breakpoints coincide with type (i) breakpoints of f at which $b + \tau$ coincides with a red point. Hence, in between any two consecutive events, we can consider Δ'_j as a linear function. See Figure 3.4 for an illustration.

We can then express the cost of changing the matching for the entire suffix b_j, \dots, b_t as $\Delta_j(\tau) = \sum_{k=j}^t \Delta'_k(\tau)$. This function is again decreasing, piecewise linear, and has breakpoints that coincide with type (i) breakpoints of f . When $\Delta_j(\tau)$ becomes non-positive it becomes beneficial to match the suffix b_j, \dots, b_t to $r_{u-j+1}, \dots, r_{u+1}$. Hence, the first such translation is given by a root of $\Delta_j(\tau)$. Note that there is at most one such root since Δ_j is decreasing.

It now follows that (if it exists) the root τ' of the function $g_i(\tau) = \min_{j \in \{s, \dots, t\}} \Delta_j(\tau)$ expresses the earliest time that there is a suffix b_j, \dots, b_t for which it is beneficial to update the matching. As before, this function is decreasing and piecewise linear. Hence, we obtain:

Lemma 3.9. *Let $[\tau_1, \tau'] \ni \tau$ be a maximal interval on which $f(\tau)$ is linear, let τ' be a type (ii) breakpoint, and let ϕ be an optimal matching for τ . Then there is a run B_i induced by ϕ , and τ' is a root of the function $g_i(\tau)$.*




Figure 3.4: Each point b_j in a run $B_i = b_s, \dots, b_t$ defines a (piecewise)-linear function Δ'_j . Each suffix b_j, \dots, b_t then defines a linear function Δ_j , expressing the cost of switching from matching ϕ to ϕ' . The lower envelope g_i of these functions then defines the first type (ii) event τ' of run B_i .

Representing the lower envelope g_i . At any moment of our sweep, we maintain a single piece of g_i . Hence, this piece is the lower envelope of a set of linear functions $\Delta_s, \dots, \Delta_t$. We will maintain this lower envelope using an adapted version of the data structure by Overmars and van Leeuwen [38]. Ideally, we would maintain the lower envelope of $\Delta_s, \dots, \Delta_t$ directly. However, reassigning a single blue point b_j in the matching ϕ , may cause many functions Δ_k to change. So, we implicitly represent each function Δ_j as a sum of Δ'_k functions.

Lemma 3.10. *Let B_i be a run of size k . We can represent the current piece of the lower envelope g_i such that we can find the root of (this piece of) g_i in $\mathcal{O}(\log k)$ time, and insert or remove any point in B_i in $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 k)$ time.*

Proof. We will maintain this lower envelope using (a slightly adapted version of) the data structure by Overmars and van Leeuwen [38]. They present a data structure to store a lower envelope of m lines while allowing queries such as line intersections in $\mathcal{O}(\log m)$ time, as well as insertions and deletions in $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 m)$ time. We could insert the lines $\Delta_s, \dots, \Delta_t$ into this data structure so we can efficiently find the root of g_i . However, an update to ϕ causes an update to a function Δ'_k , can cause changes in many functions Δ_j , and therefore require significant changes to g_i . To do handle such updates efficiently, we will make a small modification to the data structure.

As a static lower envelope data structure, they use a binary tree whose leaves are only the lines that contribute to the lower envelope, sorted based on slope. To take advantage of this, we first note that $\Delta_j(\tau)$ never has greater slope than Δ_{j+1} , because $\Delta_j(\tau) = \Delta'_j(\tau) + \Delta_{j+1}(\tau)$ and Δ'_j has a non-positive slope. This means that in such a tree we can have the leaves sorted based on the indices of the points. To allow for efficient updates, we will not store these functions at the corresponding leaf nodes, but implicitly along the path from the root to that leaf. More concretely, for a node v whose subtree has leftmost leaf b_s and where the leaf to the right of its rightmost leaf is b_t , we store $\ell_v(\tau) = \sum_{j=s}^{t-1} \Delta'_j(\tau)$. If there is no leaf further to the right, then we instead let b_t be the rightmost point of the complete run and set $\ell_v(\tau) = \sum_{j=s}^t \Delta'_j(\tau)$. Now for a given leaf b_j , we get exactly Δ_j if we add ℓ_v for every node v where the path to b_j visits the right sibling of v .

All queries on the lower envelope work by moving down a path from the root, so we can keep track of the sum accumulated along the path so far and offset the querying line or lower envelope with this. To steer the search path, each node v also stores pointers to its subtree's leftmost and rightmost leaf. When using these pointers, we need to be careful to still add the appropriate offsets so we actually consider the functions $\Delta_j(\tau)$: for the rightmost leaf this offset is zero, for the leftmost leaf b_j this is $\ell_v(\tau) - \Delta'_j$. This does not affect query times.

Given the lower envelope for b_s, \dots, b_j and b_{j+1}, \dots, b_t , the lower envelope for b_s, \dots, b_t can be calculated as in the original data structure: by finding where the two envelopes intersect, splitting off the leaves of b_s, \dots, b_j left from the intersection and of b_{j+1}, \dots, b_t right from it, then merging what remains of the two trees. To maintain the correct functions $\ell_v(\tau)$, we only need to update the nodes




Figure 3.5: We sweep the domain of f , while maintaining a representation of the current piece f' of f , and the best translation $\tau^* \leq \tau$ found so far. Breakpoints correspond to type (i) or type (ii) events.

along the path to the rightmost leaf that came from b_s, \dots, b_j . Thus, this operation still takes $\mathcal{O}(\log(t-s))$ time. We can now make the dynamic data structure of Overmars and van Leeuwen [38] use this modified static lower envelope structure to modify it while keeping the same asymptotic running times. \square

The main algorithm. Our main algorithm sweeps the space of all possible translations, while maintaining an optimal matching ϕ for the current translation τ , a representation of the current piece of the function f (i.e., the linear function f' for which $f(\tau) = f'(\tau)$), and the best translation $\tau^* \leq \tau$ found so far. To support the sweep, we also maintain a Lemma 3.10 data structure for each run B_i induced by ϕ , and a global priority queue. The Lemma 3.10 data structure allows us to efficiently obtain the next type (ii) event of a run B_i . The global priority queue stores all type (i) events, as well as the first type (ii) event of each run.

We initialize the priority queue by inserting all translations for which a pair $(b, r) \in B \times R$ coincide as type (i) events. Let τ_0 be the first such event. For a translation $\tau < \tau_0$, the matching ϕ that assigns b_i to r_i is optimal (by Lemma 3.1). Hence, we use ϕ as the initial matching. We compute the corresponding function f' expressing the cost of ϕ , construct the data structure of Lemma 3.10 on the single run induced by ϕ , and query it for its first type (ii) event. We add this event to the priority queue. All of this can be done in $\mathcal{O}(mn)$ time.

To handle a type (i) event involving point b_j , we remove it from the data structure for its run and add it back in the same place with its updated linear function $\Delta'_j(\tau)$. We query the data structure to find the next type (ii) event of the run B_i containing b_j , and update the event of B_i in the global priority queue if needed. Finally, if b_j is aligned with $\phi(b_j)$ in the event, we update f' by adding the function $2(b_j + \tau - \phi(b_j))$ and evaluate it. Handling an event of type (i) takes $\mathcal{O}(\log n + \log^2 m)$ time, as it involves a constant number of operations in the global priority queue, each taking $\mathcal{O}(\log(nm)) = \mathcal{O}(\log n)$ time, and a constant number of operations involving the Lemma 3.10 data structures, each taking $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 m)$ time.

To handle a type (ii) event where the matching changes for points $b_j, \dots, b_t \in B_i$, we remove each point from the data structure for B_i and then add them to the run they are now a part of (which can be either the existing run B_{i+1} or a new run in between B_i and B_{i+1}). This takes $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 m)$ time per point, but as argued in Lemma 3.8 each point can only be involved in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ events of this type, so over all events, this takes $\mathcal{O}(nm \log^2 m)$ time. We then recompute the type (ii) events corresponding to the at most two affected runs in $\mathcal{O}(\log m)$ time, and update them in the global priority queue in $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ time. Here, we update f' by adding the (linear) cost function $\Delta_i(\tau)$ associated with the event.

Thus, we handle a total of $\mathcal{O}(nm)$ events of type (i), each taking $\mathcal{O}(\log n + \log^2 m)$ time, and $\mathcal{O}(nm)$ events of type (ii), which take a total of $\mathcal{O}(nm(\log n + \log^2 m))$ time as well.

Once we have processed all events, the algorithm has found an optimal translation τ^* . We run the sweep once more from the start, and stop at translation τ^* , then report the current matching ϕ as an optimal matching. Together with Theorem 3.2, this thus establishes Theorem 1.1.




Figure 4.1: Gadgets for red and blue vectors in $d = 2$. The top figure shows $R(x)$ for $x = (1, 0)$, and the bottom figure illustrates $B(y)$ for $y = (0, 1)$. Since x and y are orthogonal, each blue point corresponds to a red point with the same coordinate.

4 Lower bound in one dimension

In the Orthogonal Vectors problem (OV) we are given two sets of vectors $X, Y \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$ of size $|X| = |Y| = n$ and the task is to decide whether there exist $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ with $x \cdot y = 0$, where $x \cdot y = \sum_{i=1}^d x[i] \cdot y[i]$. A naive algorithm solves this problem in time $\mathcal{O}(n^2d)$.

Hypothesis 4.1 (Orthogonal Vectors Hypothesis (OVH) [44, 45]). *No algorithm solves the Orthogonal Vectors problem in time $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\delta}d^c)$ for any constants $\delta, c > 0$.*

In this section we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 4.2. *Assuming OVH, for any constant $\delta > 0$ there is no algorithm that, given sets $B, R \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ of size $n = |R| \geq |B| = \Omega(n)$, computes $\text{EMDuT}(B, R)$ in time $\mathcal{O}(n^{2-\delta})$. This even holds with the additional restriction $B, R \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, \mathcal{O}(n^4)\}$.*

Observe that this immediately implies Theorem 1.2 because each coordinate is bounded by a polynomial. Hence, from now on, we focus on the proof of Theorem 4.2. In Section 4.1 we first construct vector gadgets. In Section 4.2 we show how, given sets X and Y of vectors, we use these gadgets to construct the sets of points R and B . We prove some useful properties of these sets in Section 4.3, and finally in Section 4.4 we prove correctness of the reduction.

4.1 Vector gadgets

We have two different types of gadgets depending on whether a vector belongs to set X or Y (see Figure 4.1 for illustration):

Definition 4.3 (Red Vectors). *For a vector $x \in \{0, 1\}^d$, create a group of points $R(x)$ to consist of: $8d$ points at the coordinate 0, and $8d$ points at the coordinate $4d + 1$. Next, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$: (i) if $x[i] = 0$, we put points $\{4i - 3, 4i - 2, 4i - 1, 4i\}$, and (ii) if $x[i] = 1$, we put points $\{4i - 2, 4i - 1\}$.*

Definition 4.4 (Blue Vectors). *For a vector $y \in \{0, 1\}^d$, create a group of points $B(y)$: (i) if $y[i] = 0$ put points $\{4i - 2, 4i - 1\}$, and (ii) if $y[i] = 1$ put points $\{4i - 3, 4i\}$.*

Next, we show that the above gadgets simulate the orthogonality.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^d$ be d -dimensional vectors.*

1. *If x and y are orthogonal then $\text{EMD}(B(y), R(x)) = 0$.*
2. *If x and y are not orthogonal then $\text{EMD}(B(y) + \tau, R(x)) \geq 1$ for all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Moreover, for every $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\text{EMD}(B(y) + \tau, R(x)) \geq |\tau|$. If $|\tau| \geq 4d + 1$, then we even have $\text{EMD}(B(y) + \tau, R(x)) = |\tau| \cdot c_1 + c_2$, where $c_1 = 2d$ and $c_2 = -4d^2 - d$.

Proof. For the proof of Property 1, assume that x and y are orthogonal. We construct a matching such that $\text{EMD}(B(y), R(x)) = 0$. Fix an index $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. If $y[i] = 1$, then $x[i] = 0$; therefore, points at the coordinates $\{4i - 3, 4i\}$ exist in $R(x)$ and we can match points of $B(y)$ at these coordinates. If $y[i] = 0$, then notice the points at coordinates $\{4i - 2, 4i - 1\}$ of $R(x)$ always exist. Hence, we can match points of $B(y)$ at these coordinates precisely.

Next, we prove Property 2. Consider any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. If $|\tau| > 1$, it is addressed by the last property, so assume $|\tau| \leq 1$. One of the leftmost or rightmost points of $B(y)$ must be matched by an edge of length $|\tau|$ (in the case when $\tau = 0$, all of them are matched exactly). Assume that x and y are not orthogonal. This means that there exists an $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $x[i] = y[i] = 1$. By construction, $B(y)$ contains a point at the coordinate $4i$, but $R(x)$ does not contain such a point. Because the smallest distance between points is $|1 - \tau|$, it follows that $\text{EMD}(B(y), R(x)) \geq |1 - \tau| + |\tau| \geq 1$.

Finally, we focus on the proof of the last property. Consider any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. If $\tau \neq 0$, then either the leftmost or rightmost $2d$ points of $B(y)$ are not matched to the point on the same coordinate as them. Therefore, $\text{EMD}(B(y) + \tau, R(x)) \geq |\tau|$. Now, consider τ with $|\tau| \geq 4d + 1$. Observe that $B(y) + \tau$ contains $2d$ points in total. The closest point in $R(x)$ to each of them is at the coordinate 0 or $4d + 1$. Because there are $8d$ such points, there are enough points to match each point in $B(y)$ to the closest point in $R(x)$. Hence, $\text{EMD}(B(y) + \tau, R(x))$ matches each point of $B(y)$ to a point at the coordinate 0 or $4d + 1$ of $R(x)$. If $\tau > 4d + 1$, the cost of the matching is

$$\text{EMD}(B(y) + \tau, R(x)) = \sum_{i=1}^d \tau - (4d + 1) + (4i - 2 - y[i]) + \sum_{i=1}^d \tau - (4d + 1) + (4i - 1 + y[i]).$$

This is equal to $\text{EMD}(B(y) + \tau, R(x)) = 2d\tau - 4d^2 - d$. Consequently, we can take $c_1 = 2d$ and $c_2 = -4d^2 - d$. It remains to check whether the above choice is correct for $\tau < -(4d + 1)$. In that case, the cost of the matching is

$$\text{EMD}(B(y) + \tau, R(x)) = \sum_{i=1}^d |\tau| - (4i - 2 - y[i]) + \sum_{i=1}^d |\tau| - (4i - 1 + y[i]).$$

This, again, after simplification is equal to $2d|\tau| - 4d^2 - d$ and the same choice of c_1 and c_2 works. \square

4.2 Reduction

Now we use the vector gadgets from the previous section to reduce from the Orthogonal Vectors problem to EMDuT . Specifically, given an OV instance $X, Y \subseteq \{0, 1\}^d$ of size n , we construct sets $B, R \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that from $\text{EMDuT}(B, R)$ we can easily infer whether X, Y contains an orthogonal pair of vectors or not. Our reduction takes time $\mathcal{O}(nd)$ to construct the sets B, R , in particular the constructed sets have size $\mathcal{O}(nd)$. Hence, if there would be an algorithm computing $\text{EMDuT}(B, R)$ in time $\mathcal{O}(|R|^{2-\delta})$ for some constant $\delta > 0$, then our reduction would yield an algorithm for OV running in time $\mathcal{O}((nd)^{2-\delta})$, which contradicts OVH (Hypothesis 4.1). That is, assuming OVH, $\text{EMDuT}(B, R)$ cannot be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(|R|^{2-\delta})$ for any constant $\delta > 0$.

For the reduction we can assume that n is odd, because if n is even, one can simply add a vector consisting exclusively of 1s to both X and Y . We can also assume that $d \leq n$, since otherwise the naive algorithm for OV already runs in time $\mathcal{O}(n^2d) = \mathcal{O}(nd^2)$. Our reduction constructs the following point sets, for $\Delta := 1000dn$:

- **Red Points:** For the i^{th} vector $x_i \in X$, we create five red gadgets $R(x_i)^{(1)}, \dots, R(x_i)^{(5)}$. For each $k \in [5]$, we translate $R(x_i)^{(k)}$ by $(i + kn) \cdot (n - 1)\Delta$ and call it $(i + kn)^{\text{th}}$ red cell.
- **Blue Points:** For the j^{th} vector $y_j \in Y$, we create a blue gadget $B(y_j)$ and translate it by $j \cdot n\Delta$. This set of points is called the j^{th} blue cell.

We create five copies of red points for a technical reason that will become clear later (just three copies is enough, but then we would need to argue about two types of optimal translations in the analysis). We denote the set of all red points by R , and the set of all blue points by B . This concludes the construction. Observe that B, R can be constructed in time $\mathcal{O}(nd)$, as claimed, and that their coordinates are in $\{0, \dots, \mathcal{O}(dn^3)\} \subseteq \{0, \dots, \mathcal{O}(n^4)\}$. Let c_1 and c_2 , where c_1, c_2 are the constants (that depend on d) from Lemma 4.5. Let

$$\Lambda := c_1 \Delta \cdot (n^2 - 1)/4 + c_2 \cdot (n - 1).$$

It remains to prove that the sets X, Y contain orthogonal vectors if and only if $\text{EMDuT}(B, R) \leq \Lambda$ (and thus from the value $\text{EMDuT}(B, R)$ we can easily infer whether X, Y contain orthogonal vectors).

4.3 Properties of the construction

We now prove several useful properties about the construction described above.

Proposition 4.6. *There exist $i_\tau, j_\tau \in \{0, \dots, n - 1\}$ and $\varepsilon \in (-1/2, 1/2]$ such that:*

$$\tau := ((n - 1)(2n + i_\tau) - nj_\tau + \varepsilon) \cdot \Delta. \quad (4.1)$$

such that $\text{EMD}(B + \tau, R) = \text{EMD}(B, R)$.

Proof. Let $\lambda := (n - 1)n\Delta$. We will show that there exists an $\tau \in [\lambda, 3\lambda]$ such that $\text{EMD}(B + \tau, R) = \text{EMD}(B, R)$. This will conclude the proof, because (i) (4.1) is minimized for $i_\tau = 0$ and $j_\tau = n - 1$ (ii) is maximized when $j_\tau = 0$ and $i_\tau = n - 1$, and (iii) steps of i_τ, j_τ are Δ and $\varepsilon\Delta \in [-\Delta/2, \Delta/2]$. Hence every real number in $[\lambda, 3\lambda]$ is covered by some choice of i_τ, j_τ and ε .

If $\tau < \lambda$, then we claim that $\text{EMD}(B + \tau, R) \geq \text{EMD}(B + \tau + \lambda, R)$. This holds, because (i) the right endpoint of $B + \tau + \lambda$ is on the left of right endpoint of R , and (ii) because R is periodic, with period λ , each edge of the matching $\text{EMD}(B + \tau, R)$ can be shifted by λ .

An analogous argument ensures that when $\tau > 3\lambda$, then $\text{EMD}(B + \tau, R) \geq \text{EMD}(B + \tau - \lambda, R)$. \square

From now, we assume that our optimal translation is of the form (4.1) and the parameters i_τ, j_τ and ε are known. The idea behind this form is to have the property that the i_τ^{th} red cell and j_τ^{th} blue cell “nearly-align”. Before we explain it in more details, our goal is to show that $|\varepsilon|$ is small.

To this end, we will use the following equality:

Proposition 4.7. *If $j_\tau \in \{0, \dots, n - 1\}$, then for every $\varepsilon \in (-1/2, 1/2]$ it holds that:*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \min\{|k - j_\tau + \varepsilon|, |n - 1 + k - j_\tau + \varepsilon|, |n - 1 - k + j_\tau - \varepsilon|\} = |\varepsilon| + (n^2 - 1)/4.$$

Proof. First, consider $j \leq (n - 1)/2$. Then $|k - j| \leq |n - 1 + j - j|$ and we need to show:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \min\{|k - j + \varepsilon|, |n - 1 - k + j - \varepsilon|\} = |\varepsilon| + (n^2 - 1)/4. \quad (4.2)$$

The proof when $j \geq (n + 1)/2$ is analogous, as then $|k - j| \geq |n - 1 + k - j|$. Then, one can take $j' = j - (n - 1)/2$, observe that $|n - 1 + k - j| = |k - j'|$ and repeat our arguments. Hence, we focus on proving (4.2) under the assumption that $j \leq (n - 1)/2$. The sum in (4.2) sum can be stratified into:

$$|\varepsilon| + \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} |k - j + \varepsilon| + \sum_{k=j+1}^{(n-1)/2+j} |k - j + \varepsilon| + \sum_{k=(n+1)/2+j}^n |n - 1 - k + j - \varepsilon|.$$

Now, we can deduce the sign of each absolute value, so:

$$|\varepsilon| + \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} (j - k - \varepsilon) + \sum_{k=j+1}^{(n-1)/2+j} (k - j + \varepsilon) + \sum_{k=(n+1)/2+j}^n (n - 1 - k + j - \varepsilon).$$

Observe, that the number of ε with positive and negative signs is equal $(n - 1)/2$, hence these cancel out and:

$$|\varepsilon| + \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} (j - k) + \sum_{k=j+1}^{(n-1)/2+j} (k - j) + \sum_{k=(n+1)/2+j}^n (n - 1 - k + j).$$

Finally, we change the summation index and conclude:

$$|\varepsilon| + \sum_{\ell=1}^j \ell + \sum_{\ell=1}^{(n-1)/2} \ell + \sum_{\ell=j+1}^{(n-1)/2} \ell = |\varepsilon| + 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{(n-1)/2} \ell = |\varepsilon| + (n^2 - 1)/4.$$

Here, we used the formula $\sum_{i=1}^m i = m(m + 1)/2$ for $m = (n - 1)/2$. \square

Property 4.8. *If $|\varepsilon| > 0.1$, then $\text{EMD}(B + \tau, R) > \Lambda$.*

Proof. Let us bound the length of $\text{EMD}(B + \tau, R)$. For the k^{th} blue cell, the distance to any closest red point is at least:

$$\min_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \{|k \cdot n\Delta + \tau - \ell \cdot (n - 1)\Delta| - 2(4d + 1)\},$$

because the width of every cell is $4d + 1$. Note that the number of points in each blue cell is exactly $2d$, hence:

$$\text{LHS} := \text{EMD}(B + \tau, R) \geq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 2d \cdot \left(\min_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \{|kn \cdot \Delta + \tau - \ell(n - 1) \cdot \Delta| - 2(4d + 1)\} \right).$$

Next, we plug in the definition of τ :

$$\text{LHS} \geq -4d(4d + 1) + 2d\Delta \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \min_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \{|(n - 1)(2n + i_\tau - j_\tau + k - \ell) + k - j_\tau + \varepsilon|\}.$$

Observe that each summand is minimized when $|2n + i_\tau - j_\tau + k - \ell| \leq 1$, hence:

$$\text{LHS} \geq -4d(4d + 1) + 2d\Delta \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \min \{|k - j_\tau + \varepsilon|, |n - 1 + k - j_\tau + \varepsilon|, |n - 1 - k + j_\tau - \varepsilon|\}.$$

Next, we recall that $j \in \{0, \dots, n - 1\}$ and use Proposition 4.7:

$$\text{LHS} \geq -4d(4d + 1) + 2d\Delta \cdot (|\varepsilon| + (n^2 - 1)/4).$$

Finally, we use $0.1 \leq |\varepsilon| \leq 0.5$ and the fact that $c_1 = 2d$:

$$\text{LHS} \geq -4d(4d + 1) + 2d\Delta|\varepsilon| + \Lambda - (n - 1)c_2 > \Lambda. \quad \square$$

Consider a cell $k \in \{0, \dots, n - 1\}$ of B . We define $\text{NearestCell}(k)$ as:

$$\text{NearestCell}(k) = \begin{cases} 2n + i_\tau - j_\tau + k & \text{if } |k - j_\tau| < n/2, \\ 2n + i_\tau - j_\tau + k + 1 & \text{if } k - j_\tau > n/2, \\ 2n + i_\tau - j_\tau + k - 1 & \text{if } k - j_\tau < -n/2. \end{cases}$$

Recall that n is odd, and hence all the cases are covered. We show that $\text{NearestCell}(k)$ is the index of the red cell that is closest to the k^{th} cell of B after translation τ , meaning that the optimal matching matches all points in the k^{th} blue cell to points in the $\text{NearestCell}(k)^{\text{th}}$ red cell:

Property 4.9. *If $|\varepsilon| < 0.1$ then each point in the k^{th} blue cell is matched to some point in the $\text{NearestCell}(k)^{\text{th}}$ red cell.*

Proof. Observe that for any τ that satisfies Proposition 4.6, it holds that every cell of $B + \tau$ lies in between two consecutive cells of R . Note that the consecutive red cells are at the shorter distance than consecutive blue cells. Hence, in between two consecutive red cells lies at most one blue cell.

Next, observe that each red cell consists of $\geq 16d$ points. Each blue cell consists of just $2d$ points. Therefore, each point cell of $B + \tau$ is matched to a point in either the next left or the next right red cell. The distance between the ℓ^{th} red cell and the k^{th} blue cell is:

$$|kn\Delta + \tau - \ell(n-1)\Delta|.$$

After plugging in the value of τ this equals:

$$|(2n + i_\tau - j_\tau + k - \ell) \cdot (n-1) - j_\tau + k + \varepsilon| \cdot \Delta.$$

Observe that when $|k - j_\tau| < n/2$ this is minimized for $\ell = 2n + i_\tau - j_\tau + k$. When $|k - j_\tau| > n/2$ we have two cases based on the sign of $(k - j_\tau)$ which matches the definition of the $\text{NearestCell}(k)$ cell because $|\varepsilon| < 0.1$. \square

4.4 Equivalence

We prove the equivalence by showing two implications separately.

Lemma 4.10. *If every pair of vectors $x \in X, y \in Y$ is not orthogonal, then $\text{EMD}(B + \tau, R) > \Lambda$.*

Proof. We assume that τ is of form defined in Proposition 4.6 as otherwise $\text{EMD}(B + \tau, R)$ is large. Moreover, by Property 4.8 we can assume that $|\varepsilon| \leq 0.1$. The distance between the left endpoint of the k^{th} cell of B and the leftmost endpoint of the nearest cell of R is given by:

$$|(n-1) \cdot \text{NearestCell}(k) \cdot \Delta - nk \cdot \Delta - \tau|.$$

Because each pair of vectors in the instance is not orthogonal, by Lemma 4.5, we know that the smallest distance between points in each cell is at least 1. Hence, after plugging in the definition of $\text{NearestCell}(k)$ and by Lemma 4.5, the contribution of points in the k^{th} cell of B to $\text{EMD}(B + \tau, R)$ is:

$$\text{Cost}(k) \geq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = j_\tau, \\ |j_\tau - k + \varepsilon| \cdot c_1\Delta + c_2 & \text{if } |k - j_\tau| < n/2, \\ (n-1 - |j_\tau - k + \varepsilon|) \cdot c_1\Delta + c_2 & \text{if } |k - j_\tau| > n/2. \end{cases}$$

Observe that $\text{Cost}(k)$ is at least $c_1\Delta \cdot \min\{|j_\tau - k + \varepsilon|, |n-1 - j_\tau + k - \varepsilon|, |n-1 + j_\tau - k + \varepsilon|\} + c_2$ when $k \neq j_\tau$. Hence, the total length of $\text{EMD}(B + \tau, R)$ is at least:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \text{Cost}(k) \geq 1 + (n-1)c_2 + c_1\Delta \left(\sum_{k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} \setminus \{j_\tau\}} \min\{|j_\tau - k + \varepsilon|, |n-1 - j_\tau + k - \varepsilon|, |n-1 + j_\tau - k + \varepsilon|\} \right).$$

Next, let us focus on the last term. We use Proposition 4.7 to conclude that:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \text{Cost}(k) \geq 1 + c_2(n-1) + c_1\Delta \cdot (n^2 - 1)/4 = 1 + \Lambda. \quad \square$$

Lemma 4.11. *If $x_i \in X$ and $y_j \in Y$ are orthogonal, then $\text{EMDuT}(B, R) \leq \Lambda$.*

Proof. Take $\tau^* = ((n-1)(2n+i) - nj) \cdot \Delta$. Observe that the $(2n+i)^{\text{th}}$ cell of R and the j^{th} cell of B align. Because x_i and y_j are orthogonal, Lemma 4.5 guarantees that $\text{EMD}(R(x_i), B(y_j)) = 0$. By Property 4.9, all remaining cells are matched to their closest cell. Therefore, by Lemma 4.5 the contribution of edges with endpoints in the k^{th} cell of B to $\text{EMD}(B + \tau^*, R)$ is

$$\text{Cost}(k) = |(n-1)\text{NearestCell}(k) \cdot \Delta - nk \cdot \Delta - \tau^*| \cdot c_1 + c_2,$$

for any $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} \setminus \{j\}$. By plugging in the exact values of $\text{NearestCell}(k)$, with the similar arguments as in the previous proof, we conclude that:

$$\text{Cost}(k) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k = j, \\ |j-k| \cdot c_1 \Delta + c_2 & \text{if } |k-j| < n/2, \\ (n-1-|j-k|) \cdot c_1 \Delta + c_2 & \text{if } |k-j| \geq n/2. \end{cases}$$

Observe that equivalently, we can write $\text{Cost}(k) = c_1 \Delta \cdot \min\{|j-k|, |n-1-j+k|, |n-1+j-k|\} + c_2$ when $k \neq j$. Therefore, the total length of the matching is:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \text{Cost}(k) &= \sum_{k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} \setminus \{j\}} c_2 + \Delta c_1 \cdot \min\{|j-k|, |n-1-j+k|, |n-1+j-k|\} \\ &= c_2(n-1) + 2\Delta c_1 \cdot (n^2-1)/4 = \Lambda. \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used Proposition 4.7. □

5 Lower bounds in higher dimension

In this section, we prove conditional lower bounds for approximating EMDuT with the L_1 or L_∞ norm. Our lower bounds assume the popular Exponential Time Hypothesis (ETH), which postulates that the 3-SAT problem on N variables cannot be solved in time $2^{o(N)}$ [29].

Theorem 5.1. *Assuming ETH, there is no algorithm that, given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $B, R \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ of size $|B| = |R| = n$, computes a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation of $\text{EMDuT}_1(B, R)$ (or $\text{EMDuT}_\infty(B, R)$) and runs in time $(\frac{n}{\varepsilon})^{o(d)}$.*

We prove our lower bounds by a reduction from the k -Clique problem: Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ with N nodes, decide whether there exist distinct nodes $v_1, \dots, v_k \in V$ such that $(v_i, v_j) \in E$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. Here, we always assume that k is constant. A naive algorithm solves the k -Clique problem in time $\mathcal{O}(N^k)$. It is well known that this running time cannot be improved to $N^{o(k)}$ assuming ETH.

Theorem 5.2 ([17]). *Assuming ETH, the k -Clique problem cannot be solved in time $N^{o(k)}$.*

In our lower bounds we will use the following lemma that combines gadgets $(B_1, R_1), \dots, (B_k, R_k)$ into a single instance (B, R) whose cost is essentially the total cost of all gadgets. To prove this lemma, we simply place the gadgets sufficiently far apart.

Lemma 5.3 (Gadget Combination Lemma). *Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Given sets $B_1, R_1, \dots, B_k, R_k \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of total size n with $|B_i| \leq |R_i|$ for all $i \in [k]$, in time $\mathcal{O}(nd)$ we can compute sets $B, R \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of total size n such that*

$$\text{EMDuT}_p(B, R) = \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{i=1}^k \text{EMD}_p(B_i + \tau, R_i).$$

Proof. The intuition is as follows. For a sufficiently large number U we construct the sets $B := \bigcup_{i=1}^k B_i + (U \cdot i, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $R := \bigcup_{i=1}^k R_i + (U \cdot i, 0, \dots, 0)$, i.e., we place the gadgets sufficiently far apart. Then one can argue that any optimal matching must match points in B_i to points in R_i , and thus the EMDuT cost splits over the gadgets as claimed.

Now we provide the proof details. Let \mathcal{B} be the bounding box of $\bigcup_{i=1}^k B_i \cup R_i$, and let Δ be the sum of all side lengths of \mathcal{B} (i.e., Δ is the L_1 diameter of \mathcal{B}). We set $U := (2n + 5)\Delta$. We construct the sets B, R as

$$B := \bigcup_{i=1}^k B_i + (U \cdot i, 0, \dots, 0), \quad R := \bigcup_{i=1}^k R_i + (U \cdot i, 0, \dots, 0).$$

Note that we have

$$\text{EMDuT}_p(B, R) = \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d} \text{EMD}_p(B + \tau, R) \leq \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{i=1}^k \text{EMD}_p(B_i + \tau, R_i),$$

where the inequality follows from restricting the matching $\phi: (B + \tau) \rightarrow R$ to map points in $B_i + \tau$ to points in R_i for all i .

For the opposite direction, by considering $\tau := (0, \dots, 0)$ and considering any matching that maps points in $B_i + \tau$ to points in R_i for all i , we observe

$$\text{EMDuT}_p(B, R) \leq |R| \cdot \Delta \leq n\Delta.$$

Now consider an optimal translation τ^* , i.e., τ^* realizes $\text{EMDuT}_p(B, R) = \text{EMD}_p(B + \tau^*, R)$. We claim that $\|\tau^*\|_p \leq (n+2)\Delta$. Indeed, suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\|\tau^*\|_p > (n+2)\Delta$. Then any point in $B_i + \tau^*$ has distance more than $\|\tau^*\|_p - 2\Delta$ to any point in R_i . It follows that if $\tau_1^* \leq 0$, then any point in $B_1 + \tau^*$ has distance more than $\|\tau^*\|_p - 2\Delta$ to any point in R , and thus $\text{EMD}_p(B + \tau^*, R) > \|\tau^*\|_p - 2\Delta \geq n\Delta$. This contradicts $\text{EMD}_p(B + \tau^*, R) = \text{EMDuT}_p(B, R) \leq n\Delta$, as shown above. Similarly, if $\tau_1^* \geq 0$, then any point in $B_k + \tau^*$ has distance more than $\|\tau^*\|_p - 2\Delta$ to any point in R , and we again arrive at a contradiction. Hence, we have $\|\tau^*\|_p \leq (n+2)\Delta$.

Now consider an optimal matching $\phi: (B + \tau^*) \rightarrow R$. If ϕ matches any point in $B_i + \tau^*$ to any point in R_j for some $i \neq j$, then it incurs a cost of at least $U - 2\Delta - \|\tau^*\|_p \geq U - (n+4)\Delta > n\Delta$, contradicting our upper bound $\text{EMDuT}_p(B, R) \leq n\Delta$. Therefore, ϕ matches points in $B_i + \tau^*$ to points in R_i for all i , and we obtain

$$\text{EMDuT}_p(B, R) = \text{EMD}_p(B + \tau^*, R) = \sum_{i=1}^k \text{EMD}_p(B_i + \tau^*, R_i) \geq \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{i=1}^k \text{EMD}_p(B_i + \tau, R_i).$$

Both directions together prove the lemma. \square

For the readers' convenience, in Section 5.1 as a warmup we prove the lower bound for the L_1 norm in the asymmetric setting, i.e., we allow $|B|$ to be smaller than $|R| = n$. Then in Section 5.2 we strengthen this lower bound to hold even in the symmetric setting $|B| = |R| = n$. Finally, in Section 5.3 we prove the lower bound for the L_∞ norm in the symmetric setting.

5.1 Lower bound for L_1 asymmetric

In this section we prove Theorem 5.1 for the L_1 norm in the asymmetric setting, i.e., we relax the condition $|B| = |R|$ to $|B| \leq |R|$.

We are given a k -Clique instance $G = ([N], E)$. We set the dimension to $d := k$. In what follows by $p_{i,u,j,v,b} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we denote the point with coordinates, for $\ell \in [d]$,

$$(p_{i,u,j,v,b})_\ell = \begin{cases} u & \text{if } \ell = i, \\ v & \text{if } \ell = j, \\ b & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$




Figure 5.1: The left figure illustrates gadget $(B_{i,j}, R_{i,j})$. The right figure illustrates gadget $(B'_{i,j}, R'_{i,j})$.

We construct the following $2^{\binom{k}{2}}$ gadgets. For any $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ we construct

$$\begin{aligned} B_{i,j} &:= \{(0, \dots, 0)\}, & R_{i,j} &:= \{p_{i,u,j,v,0} \mid (u, v) \in E\}, \\ B'_{i,j} &:= \{(0, \dots, 0)\}, & R'_{i,j} &:= \{p_{i,u,j,v,N} \mid (u, v) \in E\}. \end{aligned}$$

The cost of these gadgets has the following properties.²

Lemma 5.4. *Let $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. For any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have*

$$\text{EMD}_1(B_{i,j} + \tau, R_{i,j}) + \text{EMD}_1(B'_{i,j} + \tau, R'_{i,j}) \geq (d-2)N,$$

and equality holds if $\tau \in [N]^d$ and $(\tau_i, \tau_j) \in E$. Moreover, for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $(\lfloor \tau_i \rfloor, \lfloor \tau_j \rfloor) \notin E$ we have

$$\text{EMD}_1(B_{i,j} + \tau, R_{i,j}) + \text{EMD}_1(B'_{i,j} + \tau, R'_{i,j}) \geq (d-2)N + 1.$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{EMD}_1(B_{i,j} + \tau, R_{i,j}) &= \min_{(u,v) \in E} \|(0, \dots, 0) + \tau - p_{i,u,j,v,0}\|_1 = \min_{(u,v) \in E} |\tau_i - u| + |\tau_j - v| + \sum_{\ell \neq i,j} |\tau_\ell| \\ &\geq \min_{(u,v) \in E} |\tau_i - u| + |\tau_j - v| + \sum_{\ell \neq i,j} \tau_\ell, \end{aligned}$$

where equality holds if $\tau \in [N]^d$. We similarly bound

$$\text{EMD}_1(B'_{i,j} + \tau, R'_{i,j}) \geq \min_{(u,v) \in E} |\tau_i - u| + |\tau_j - v| + \sum_{\ell \neq i,j} N - \tau_\ell,$$

where equality holds if $\tau \in [N]^d$. Summing up and bounding the absolute values by 0, we obtain

$$\text{EMD}_1(B_{i,j} + \tau, R_{i,j}) + \text{EMD}_1(B'_{i,j} + \tau, R'_{i,j}) \geq (d-2)N.$$

If $\tau \in [N]^d$ and $(\tau_i, \tau_j) \in E$, then we can pick u, v with $|\tau_i - u| + |\tau_j - v| = 0$, and we obtain equality.

Moreover, for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $(\lfloor \tau_i \rfloor, \lfloor \tau_j \rfloor) \notin E$, note that since (τ_i, τ_j) has L_∞ distance at most $1/2$ to $(\lfloor \tau_i \rfloor, \lfloor \tau_j \rfloor)$, it has L_∞ distance at least $1/2$ to any other grid point. In particular, (τ_i, τ_j) has L_∞ distance at least $1/2$ to any $(u, v) \in E$. Since L_∞ distance lower bounds L_1 distance, we obtain $\min_{(u,v) \in E} |\tau_i - u| + |\tau_j - v| \geq 1/2$. This yields

$$\text{EMD}_1(B_{i,j} + \tau, R_{i,j}) + \text{EMD}_1(B'_{i,j} + \tau, R'_{i,j}) \geq 2 \min_{(u,v) \in E} (|\tau_i - u| + |\tau_j - v|) + (d-2)N \geq (d-2)N + 1. \quad \square$$

²Recall that $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the closest integer to x , while $[x]$ denotes $\{1, \dots, x\}$.

We apply the Gadget Combination Lemma to the gadgets $B_{i,j}, R_{i,j}, B'_{i,j}, R'_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq d$. The EMDuT_1 of the resulting point sets B, R is the sum of the costs of the gadgets. Hence, the above lemma implies the following. If G has a k -Clique v_1, \dots, v_k , then $\tau := (v_1, \dots, v_k) \in [N]^d$ has a total cost of $\binom{d}{2} \cdot (d-2)N =: \Lambda$. On the other hand, if G has no k -Clique, then for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exist $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ with $(\lfloor \tau_i \rfloor, \lfloor \tau_j \rfloor) \notin E$ (as otherwise $(\lfloor \tau_1 \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor \tau_k \rfloor)$ would form a k -Clique). Thus, each pair of gadgets contributes cost at least $(d-2)N$, and at least one pair of gadgets contributes cost at least $(d-2)N + 1$, so the total cost is at least $\binom{d}{2} \cdot (d-2)N + 1 = \Lambda + 1$.

For any $\varepsilon < 1/\Lambda$, a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for EMDuT_1 could distinguish cost at most Λ and cost at least $\Lambda + 1$, and thus would solve the k -Clique problem. Hence, if we would have a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for EMDuT_1 running in time $(n/\varepsilon)^{o(d)}$, then by setting $\varepsilon := 0.9/\Lambda$ and observing $n = \mathcal{O}(N^2)$, $1/\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{O}(N)$, and $d = k$, we would obtain an algorithm for k -Clique running in time $(n/\varepsilon)^{o(d)} = \mathcal{O}(N^3)^{o(k)} = N^{o(k)}$, which contradicts ETH by Theorem 5.2.

5.2 Lower Bound for L_1 Symmetric

Now we strengthen the construction to work in the symmetric setting, where the number of blue and red points is equal. To this end, we add more blue points, and for technical reasons we also need to double the number of dimensions.

We are given a k -Clique instance $G = ([N], E)$. We set the dimension to $d := 2k$. In what follows by $\bar{p}_{i,u,j,v,b} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $q_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we denote the points with coordinates, for $\ell \in [d]$,

$$(\bar{p}_{i,u,j,v,b})_\ell = \begin{cases} u & \text{if } \ell \in \{i, i+k\}, \\ v & \text{if } \ell \in \{j, j+k\}, \\ b & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (q_{i,j})_\ell = \begin{cases} N & \text{if } \ell \in \{i, j\}, \\ -N & \text{if } \ell \in \{i+k, j+k\}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We construct the following $2\binom{k}{2}$ gadgets. For any $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ we construct³

$$\begin{aligned} B_{i,j} &:= \{(0, \dots, 0)\} \cup \{|E| - 1 \text{ copies of } q_{i,j}\}, & R_{i,j} &:= \{\bar{p}_{i,u,j,v,0} \mid (u, v) \in E\}, \\ B'_{i,j} &:= \{(0, \dots, 0)\} \cup \{|E| - 1 \text{ copies of } -q_{i,j}\}, & R'_{i,j} &:= \{\bar{p}_{i,u,j,v,N} \mid (u, v) \in E\}. \end{aligned}$$

The cost of these gadgets has the following properties.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. For any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have*

$$\text{EMD}_1(B_{i,j} + \tau, R_{i,j}) + \text{EMD}_1(B'_{i,j} + \tau, R'_{i,j}) \geq ((d+4)|E| - 8)N,$$

with equality if $\tau \in [N]^d$ and $(\tau_i, \tau_j) = (\tau_{i+k}, \tau_{j+k}) \in E$. For any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $(\lfloor \tau_i \rfloor, \lfloor \tau_j \rfloor) \notin E$ we have

$$\text{EMD}_1(B_{i,j} + \tau, R_{i,j}) + \text{EMD}_1(B'_{i,j} + \tau, R'_{i,j}) \geq ((d+4)|E| - 8)N + 1.$$

Proof. Note that in any dimension $\ell \notin \{i, j, i+k, j+k\}$ all points in $B_{i,j}$ and $B'_{i,j}$ have coordinate 0, and thus the contribution of these dimensions to the total cost does not depend on the matching. For $(B_{i,j}, R_{i,j})$ such a dimension ℓ contributes $|E| \cdot |\tau_\ell| \geq |E|\tau_\ell$ to the total cost, and for $(B'_{i,j}, R'_{i,j})$ it contributes $|E| \cdot |N - \tau_\ell| \geq |E|(N - \tau_\ell)$. Summing up over both gadgets and all $\ell \notin \{i, j, i+k, j+k\}$ yields total cost at least $(d-4)|E|N$, with equality if $\tau \in [N]^d$.

In the remainder we can focus on the dimensions $i, j, i+k, j+k$. Projected onto these dimensions, the L_1 distance from $q_{i,j} + \tau$ to $\bar{p}_{i,u,j,v,0}$ is

$$|N + \tau_i - u| + |N + \tau_j - v| + |N - \tau_{i+k} + u| + |N - \tau_{j+k} + v| \geq 4N + \tau_i + \tau_j - \tau_{i+k} - \tau_{j+k},$$

³Here, we treat $B_{i,j}$ as a multi-set, containing $|E| - 1$ times the points $q_{i,j}$. This can be avoided by adding a tiny perturbation to each copy, which makes $B_{i,j}$ a set without significantly changing any distances.

where we used $|x| \geq x$. Furthermore, equality holds if $\tau \in [N]^d$. Analogously, one can show that projected onto the dimensions $i, j, i+k, j+k$ the L_1 distance from $-q_{i,j} + \tau$ to $\bar{p}_{i,u,j,v,N}$ is

$$\geq 4N - \tau_i - \tau_j + \tau_{i+k} + \tau_{j+k},$$

with equality if $\tau \in [N]^d$. Similarly, projected onto the dimensions $i, j, i+k, j+k$ the L_1 distance from $(0, \dots, 0) + \tau$ to $\bar{p}_{i,u,j,v,0}$ (or to $\bar{p}_{i,u,j,v,N}$) is

$$|\tau_i - u| + |\tau_j - v| + |\tau_{i+k} - u| + |\tau_{j+k} - v|.$$

By summing up everything, and noting that the terms $\tau_i + \tau_j - \tau_{i+k} - \tau_{j+k}$ and $-\tau_i - \tau_j + \tau_{i+k} + \tau_{j+k}$ cancel, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{EMD}_1(B_{i,j} + \tau, R_{i,j}) + \text{EMD}_1(B'_{i,j} + \tau, R'_{i,j}) \\ & \geq 2 \min_{(u,v) \in E} |\tau_i - u| + |\tau_j - v| + |\tau_{i+k} - u| + |\tau_{j+k} - v| + (|E| - 1) \cdot 2 \cdot 4N + (d - 4)|E|N, \end{aligned}$$

with equality if $\tau \in [N]^d$. Bounding the absolute values by 0 and simplifying, we obtain

$$\text{EMD}_1(B_{i,j} + \tau, R_{i,j}) + \text{EMD}_1(B'_{i,j} + \tau, R'_{i,j}) \geq ((d + 4)|E| - 8)N,$$

with equality if $\tau \in [N]^d$ and $(\tau_i, \tau_j) = (\tau_{i+k}, \tau_{j+k}) \in E$.

Moreover, for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $(\lfloor \tau_i \rfloor, \lfloor \tau_j \rfloor) \notin E$, the point (τ_i, τ_j) has L_∞ distance at least $1/2$ to any $(u, v) \in E$, and thus $\min_{(u,v) \in E} |\tau_i - u| + |\tau_j - v| \geq 1/2$. In this case we obtain

$$\text{EMD}_1(B_{i,j} + \tau, R_{i,j}) + \text{EMD}_1(B'_{i,j} + \tau, R'_{i,j}) \geq ((d + 4)|E| - 8)N + 2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}. \quad \square$$

We apply the Gadget Combination Lemma to the gadgets $B_{i,j}, R_{i,j}, B'_{i,j}, R'_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. The EMD_{uT_1} of the resulting point sets B, R is the sum of the costs of the gadgets. Hence, the above lemma implies the following. If G has a k -Clique v_1, \dots, v_k , then $\tau := (v_1, \dots, v_k, v_1, \dots, v_k) \in [N]^d$ has a total cost of $\binom{k}{2} \cdot ((d + 4)|E| - 8)N =: \Lambda$. On the other hand, if G has no k -Clique, then for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exist $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ with $(\lfloor \tau_i \rfloor, \lfloor \tau_j \rfloor) \notin E$ (as otherwise $(\lfloor \tau_1 \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor \tau_k \rfloor)$ would form a k -Clique). Thus, each pair of gadgets contributes cost at least $((d + 4)|E| - 8)N$, and at least one pair of gadgets contributes cost at least $((d + 4)|E| - 8)N + 1$, so the total cost is at least $\binom{k}{2} \cdot ((d + 4)|E| - 8)N + 1 = \Lambda + 1$.

For any $\varepsilon < 1/\Lambda$, a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for EMD_{uT_1} could distinguish cost at most Λ and cost at least $\Lambda + 1$, and thus would solve the k -Clique problem. Hence, if we would have a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for EMD_{uT_1} running in time $(n/\varepsilon)^{o(d)}$, then by setting $\varepsilon := 0.9/\Lambda$ and observing $n = \mathcal{O}(N^2)$, $1/\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{O}(N^3)$, and $d = \mathcal{O}(k)$, we would obtain an algorithm for k -Clique running in time $(n/\varepsilon)^{o(d)} = \mathcal{O}(N^5)^{o(k)} = N^{o(k)}$, which contradicts ETH by Theorem 5.2.

5.3 Lower Bound for L_∞ Symmetric

In this section we prove Theorem 5.1 for the L_∞ norm, thus finishing the proof of this theorem.

We are given a k -Clique instance $G = ([N], E)$. We set the dimension to $d := 2k + 1$. In what follows, by $\hat{p}_{i,u,j,v,b} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $q_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $b_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we denote the points with coordinates, for $\ell \in [d]$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{p}_{i,u,j,v,b})_\ell &= \begin{cases} u & \text{if } \ell \in \{i, i+k\}, \\ v & \text{if } \ell \in \{j, j+k\}, \\ b & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} & (b_{i,j})_\ell &= \begin{cases} 10N & \text{if } \ell \in \{i, j\}, \\ -10N & \text{if } \ell \in \{i+k, j+k\}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ (q_i)_\ell &= \begin{cases} 10N & \text{if } \ell \in \{i, i+k\}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We construct the following $4(k-1)k + 2\binom{k}{2}$ gadgets. For any $i \in [k], s \in [2(k-1)]$ we construct

$$\begin{aligned} B_{i,s} &:= \{(0, \dots, 0)\}, & R_{i,s} &:= \{q_i\}, \\ B'_{i,j} &:= \{(0, \dots, 0)\}, & R'_{i,s} &:= \{-q_i\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for any $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ we construct

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{B}_{i,j} &:= \{b_{i,j}\} \cup \{|E| - 1 \text{ copies of } (0, \dots, 0, 10N)\}, & \hat{R}_{i,j} &:= \{\hat{p}_{i,u,j,v,0} \mid (u,v) \in E\}, \\ \hat{B}'_{i,j} &:= \{b_{i,j}\} \cup \{|E| - 1 \text{ copies of } (0, \dots, 0, -10N)\}, & \hat{R}'_{i,j} &:= \hat{R}_{i,j}. \end{aligned}$$

The following two lemmas analyze the properties of these gadgets.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $i \in [k]$ and $s \in [2(k-1)]$. For any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have*

$$\text{EMD}_\infty(B_{i,s} + \tau, R_{i,s}) + \text{EMD}_\infty(B'_{i,s} + \tau, R'_{i,s}) \geq 20N + |\tau_i - \tau_{i+k}|,$$

with equality if $\tau \in [N]^d$.

Proof. We have

$$\text{EMD}_\infty(B_{i,s} + \tau, R_{i,s}) = \|(0, \dots, 0) + \tau - q_i\|_\infty \geq \max\{10N - \tau_i, 10N - \tau_{i+k}\},$$

with equality if $\tau \in [N]^d$, as then the coordinates involving $10N$ dominate. Similarly, we have

$$\text{EMD}_\infty(B'_{i,s} + \tau, R'_{i,s}) \geq \max\{10N + \tau_i, 10N + \tau_{i+k}\},$$

with equality if $\tau \in [N]^d$. We bound their sum by

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{EMD}_\infty(B_{i,s} + \tau, R_{i,s}) + \text{EMD}_\infty(B'_{i,s} + \tau, R'_{i,s}) \\ &\geq \max\{(10N - \tau_i) + (10N + \tau_{i+k}), (10N - \tau_{i+k}) + (10N + \tau_i)\} = 20N + |\tau_i - \tau_{i+k}|. \end{aligned}$$

We observe that equality holds if $\tau \in [N]^d$, as then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{EMD}_\infty(B_{i,s} + \tau, R_{i,s}) + \text{EMD}_\infty(B'_{i,s} + \tau, R'_{i,s}) \\ &= \max\{(10N - \tau_i) + (10N + \tau_{i+k}), (10N - \tau_{i+k}) + (10N + \tau_i), \\ &\quad (10N - \tau_i) + (10N + \tau_i), (10N - \tau_{i+k}) + (10N + \tau_{i+k})\} = 20N + |\tau_i - \tau_{i+k}|. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.7. *Let $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. For any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have*

$$\text{EMD}_\infty(\hat{B}_{i,j} + \tau, \hat{R}_{i,j}) + \text{EMD}_\infty(\hat{B}'_{i,j} + \tau, \hat{R}'_{i,j}) \geq 20N|E| - 2|\tau_i - \tau_{i+k}| - 2|\tau_j - \tau_{j+k}|,$$

with equality if $\tau \in [N]^d$ and $(\tau_i, \tau_j) = (\tau_{i+k}, \tau_{j+k}) \in E$. For any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $(\lfloor \tau_i \rfloor, \lfloor \tau_j \rfloor) \notin E$ we have

$$\text{EMD}_\infty(\hat{B}_{i,j} + \tau, \hat{R}_{i,j}) + \text{EMD}_\infty(\hat{B}'_{i,j} + \tau, \hat{R}'_{i,j}) \geq 20N|E| - 2|\tau_i - \tau_{i+k}| - 2|\tau_j - \tau_{j+k}| + 1.$$

Proof. Since the last coordinate of any point in $\hat{R}_{i,j}$ (or $\hat{R}'_{i,j}$) is 0, its distance to $(0, \dots, 0, 10N) + \tau$ is at least $10N + \tau_d$, with equality if $\tau \in [N]^d$. Similarly, its distance to $(0, \dots, 0, -10N) + \tau$ is at least $10N - \tau_d$, with equality if $\tau \in [N]^d$. Therefore, all copies of $(0, \dots, 0, 10N)$ and $(0, \dots, 0, -10N)$ in total contribute a cost of at least $2(|E| - 1) \cdot 10N$, with equality if $\tau \in [N]^d$, no matter what points in $\hat{B}_{i,j}$ (or $\hat{B}'_{i,j}$, resp.) they are assigned to.

The remaining point $b_{i,j} + \tau$ has distance to $\hat{R}_{i,j}$ (and to $\hat{R}'_{i,j}$) of

$$\geq \min_{(u,v) \in E} \max\{10N + \tau_i - u, 10N + \tau_j - v, 10N - \tau_{i+k} + u, 10N - \tau_{j+k} + v\}. \quad (5.1)$$

Equality holds for $\tau \in [N]^d$, as then the coordinates involving $10N$ dominate. We further bound (5.1) from below by

$$\begin{aligned} &= 10N + \min_{(u,v) \in E} \max\{\tau_i - u, \tau_j - v, u - \tau_{i+k}, v - \tau_{j+k}\} \\ &\geq 10N + \min_{(u,v) \in E} \max\{\tau_i - u, u - \tau_i, \tau_j - v, v - \tau_j\} - |\tau_i - \tau_{i+k}| - |\tau_j - \tau_{j+k}| \\ &= 10N + \min_{(u,v) \in E} \max\{|\tau_i - u|, |\tau_j - v|\} - |\tau_i - \tau_{i+k}| - |\tau_j - \tau_{j+k}|. \end{aligned}$$

Equality holds if $\tau \in [N]^d$ and $(\tau_i, \tau_j) = (\tau_{i+k}, \tau_{j+k})$.

Summing up these costs, in total we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{EMD}_\infty(\hat{B}_{i,j} + \tau, \hat{R}_{i,j}) + \text{EMD}_\infty(\hat{B}'_{i,j} + \tau, \hat{R}'_{i,j}) \\ &\geq 20N|E| + 2 \min_{(u,v) \in E} \left(\max\{|\tau_i - u|, |\tau_j - v|\} - |\tau_i - \tau_{i+k}| - |\tau_j - \tau_{j+k}| \right), \end{aligned}$$

with equality if $\tau \in [N]^d$ and $(\tau_i, \tau_j) = (\tau_{i+k}, \tau_{j+k})$. By bounding the max term by 0, we obtain

$$\text{EMD}_\infty(\hat{B}_{i,j} + \tau, \hat{R}_{i,j}) + \text{EMD}_\infty(\hat{B}'_{i,j} + \tau, \hat{R}'_{i,j}) \geq 20N|E| - 2|\tau_i - \tau_{i+k}| - 2|\tau_j - \tau_{j+k}|.$$

Equality holds if $\tau \in [N]^d$ and $(\tau_i, \tau_j) = (\tau_{i+k}, \tau_{j+k}) \in E$.

Moreover, for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $(\lfloor \tau_i \rfloor, \lfloor \tau_j \rfloor) \notin E$, the point (τ_i, τ_j) has L_∞ distance at least $1/2$ from any $(u, v) \in E$, and thus $\min_{(u,v) \in E} \max\{|\tau_i - u|, |\tau_j - v|\} \geq 1/2$. In this case, we obtain cost at least

$$20N|E| + 2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} - 2|\tau_i - \tau_{i+k}| - 2|\tau_j - \tau_{j+k}|. \quad \square$$

We now apply the Gadget Combination Lemma to the gadgets $B_{i,s}, R_{i,s}, B'_{i,s}, R'_{i,s}$ for $i \in [k]$ and $s \in [2(k-1)]$ and $\hat{B}_{i,j}, \hat{R}_{i,j}, \hat{B}'_{i,j}, \hat{R}'_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. The EMDuT_∞ cost of the resulting point sets B, R is the sum of the costs of the gadgets. Hence, cost can be read off from the above lemmas. Note that for any $i \in [k]$ the terms $|\tau_i - \tau_{i+k}|$ cancel, as there are $2(k-1)$ gadget pairs contributing a $+|\tau_i - \tau_{i+k}|$ (one gadget pair for each $s \in [2(k-1)]$), and $k-1$ gadget pairs contributing a $-2|\tau_i - \tau_{i+k}|$ (one gadget pair for each $j \in [k], j \neq i$). The cost thus simplifies to

$$\text{EMD}_\infty(B + \tau, R) \geq 20N \cdot k \cdot 2(k-1) + 20N|E| \cdot \binom{k}{2} =: \Lambda.$$

We obtain equality for any translation $\tau \in [N]^d$ with $(\tau_i, \tau_j) = (\tau_{i+k}, \tau_{j+k}) \in E$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. Therefore, if G has a k -Clique v_1, \dots, v_k , then $\tau := (v_1, \dots, v_k, v_1, \dots, v_k, 0) \in [N]^d$ has a total cost of Λ . On the other hand, if G has no k -Clique, then for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exist $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ with $(\lfloor \tau_i \rfloor, \lfloor \tau_j \rfloor) \notin E$ (as otherwise $(\lfloor \tau_1 \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor \tau_k \rfloor)$ would form a k -Clique). Then according to Lemma 5.7 at least one summand has an additional $+1$, so the total cost is at least $\Lambda + 1$.

For any $\varepsilon < 1/\Lambda$, a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for EMDuT_∞ could distinguish cost at most Λ and cost at least $\Lambda + 1$, and thus would solve the k -Clique problem. Hence, if we would have a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for EMDuT_∞ running in time $(n/\varepsilon)^{o(d)}$, then by setting $\varepsilon := 0.9/\Lambda$ and observing $n = \mathcal{O}(N^2)$, $1/\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{O}(N^3)$, and $d = \mathcal{O}(k)$, we would obtain an algorithm for k -Clique running in time $(n/\varepsilon)^{o(d)} = \mathcal{O}(N^5)^{o(k)} = N^{o(k)}$, which contradicts ETH by Theorem 5.2.

6 Algorithms in higher dimensions

Given two sets R and B of n points in the plane, Eppstein et al. [23] show how to compute a translation τ^* minimizing $\text{EMDuT}_1(B, R)$ with respect to the L_1 -distance in $\mathcal{O}(n^6 \log^3 n)$ time. We observe that their result can be generalized to point sets in arbitrary dimension d , leading to an $\mathcal{O}(m^d n^{d+2} \log^{d+2} n)$ time algorithm.

Furthermore, we show that our approach can also be used to obtain an $\mathcal{O}(m^d n^{d+2} \log^{d+2} n)$ time algorithm for finding a translation that minimizes $\text{EMDuT}_\infty(B, R)$, i.e. the Earth Mover’s Distance with respect to the L_∞ distance. For point sets in \mathbb{R}^2 , this immediately follows by “rotating the plane by 45° ” and using the algorithm for L_1 . For higher dimensions this trick is no longer immediately applicable. However, we show that our algorithm can also directly be applied to the L_∞ distance, even for point sets in \mathbb{R}^d , with $d > 2$.

Earth Mover’s Distance without Translation. We first describe an algorithm to compute $\text{EMD}_p(B, R)$ in \mathbb{R}^d . Note that we assume to work in the Real RAM model, hence we need a strongly-polynomial algorithm. Naively, one can achieve that in $\mathcal{O}(m^2 n)$ time by computing the bipartite graph, and solving maximum weight matching in bipartite graph in strongly polynomial time by Edmonds and Karp [22]. Here, however, we can use the fact that points are in \mathbb{R}^d . To the best of our knowledge, the best algorithm in this setting is due to Vaidya [43]. However, he only considers the case when both point sets are in \mathbb{R}^2 and have size $n = m$ in \mathbb{R}^2 . He shows that one can compute $\text{EMD}_p(B, R)$ (with $p \in \{1, \infty\}$) in $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log^3 n)$ time in this setting. Furthermore, he states (without proof) that for point sets in \mathbb{R}^d , that the running time increases by at most $\mathcal{O}(\log^d n)$. Next, we briefly sketch the algorithm and fill in the missing details for the higher-dimensional setting, to obtain the following result:

Theorem 6.1. *Given a set B of m points in \mathbb{R}^d , and a set of $n \geq m$ red points in \mathbb{R}^d , there is an $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log^{d+2} n)$ time algorithm to compute $\text{EMD}_p(B, R)$, for $p \in \{1, \infty\}$.*

Proof. Vaidya’s algorithm is a particular implementation of the Hungarian Method [36]. Hence, to apply it we introduce $n - m$ additional “dummy” points in B . We define the distance from a dummy point to any other point in R to be zero. We stress that the dummy points are only present in the graph representation, and are not physically in \mathbb{R}^d . The main algorithm proceeds in phases, in each of which the current matching grows by one new pair. Hence, the algorithm completes after n phases. In each phase, each point $q \in B \cup R$ is assigned a weight w_q (the current value of the point in the dual LP-formulation of the problem). The algorithm then maintains a subset R' of red points (initially $R' = R$), and a subset B' of blue points (initially, B' is the set of unmatched blue points), and repeatedly computes the bichromatic closest pair (b^*, r^*) with respect to the weighted distance function $d(b, r) = \|br\|_p - w_b - w_r$. This pair is either added to the matching (if r^* is also unmatched), or the weights of b^* and r^* are updated, r^* is removed from R' , and b^* is added to B' . Since there are only n points in one set, a phase consists of at most $\mathcal{O}(n)$ such steps. Hence, given a dynamic data structure storing R' and B' that

- maintains the bichromatic (weighted) closest pair among $R' \cup B'$,
- can be built in $P(n)$ time (and thus uses at most $P(n)$ space),
- an insertion of a blue point into B' in (amortized) $I(n)$ time, and
- a deletion of a red point from R' in (amortized) $D(n)$ time,

the algorithm runs in $\mathcal{O}(n(P(n) + n(I(n) + D(n))))$ time. As we argue next, for (weighted) points in \mathbb{R}^d , there is such a data structure with $P(n) = \mathcal{O}(n \log^d n)$, and $I(n) \leq D(n) = \mathcal{O}(\log^{d+2} n)$. The Theorem then follows.

We describe a dynamic data structure for weighted nearest neighbor (NN) queries and then apply a recent result of Chan [15] to turn this into a dynamic bichromatic closest pair data structure.

Let P' be a set of weighted points in \mathbb{R}^d , let q be a weighted point, and consider the positive orthant $A(q) = \{a \mid q_i \leq a_i \text{ for all } i \in \{1, \dots, d\}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with respect to q (i.e. all points dominating q). Let $w'_z = -w_{p'} + \sum_{i=1}^d p'_i$ (see Figure 6.1). Now observe that the point $p^* \in P' \cap A(q)$ minimizing $\|p'q\| - w_{p'} - w_q$ is the point in $A(q)$ with minimum $w'_{p'}$ value.

So, we store the points in P' in a d -dimension range tree [39], in which every subtree is annotated with the point with the minimum $w'_{p'}$ value among its descendants. We can query the range tree for the nearest point among $P' \cap A(q)$ with respect to the weighted L_1 distance in $\mathcal{O}(\log^d n)$ time. By implementing the trees using generalized balanced trees [5] we can support insertions and deletions in




Figure 6.1: An example of a L_1 unit ball centered at q in \mathbb{R}^2 . Observe that all points on the line through p' with slope minus one have the same value $\sum_{i=1}^d p'_i$. For a weighted point $p' \in P'$ that lies in $A(q)$ (the yellow region), the weighted L_1 -distance between q and p' is given by $w'_p - w'_q$, hence the point from $P' \cap A(q)$ with minimum w'_p value is the nearest neighbor of q .

amortized $\mathcal{O}(\log^d n)$ time as well. We use an analogous approach for the other $2^d - 1$ orthant around q , thus allowing us to answer weighted NN queries with respect to the L_1 distance in the same time as above. We can handle the (weighted) L_∞ distance analogously by defining appropriate “orthants” around q . If P' contains any dummy points, we store them separately in a binary search tree, ordered by weight. The minimum weight dummy point is an additional candidate nearest neighbor for q , and we return the overall closest point to q . When q itself would be a dummy point (and thus has no real location), we simply obtain the minimum weight point among P' as the nearest point. Hence, it follows we can build the structure in $P_0(n) = \mathcal{O}(n \log^d n)$ time, query the nearest neighbor in $Q_0(n) = \mathcal{O}(\log^d n)$ time, and delete (and insert) points in $D_0(n) = \mathcal{O}(\log^d n)$ time.

Chan [15] shows how to turn a dynamic nearest neighbor searching data structure with preprocessing time $P_0(n)$, query time $Q_0(n)$, and deletion time $D_0(n)$ into a fully dynamic bichromatic closest pair data structure. In our particular case we obtain

- construction time $P(n) = \mathcal{O}(nQ_0(n) + P_0(n)) = \mathcal{O}(n \log^d n)$,
- amortized insertion time $I(n) = \mathcal{O}(Q_0(n) \log n + (P_0(n)/n) \log n) = \mathcal{O}(\log^{d+1} n)$, and
- amortized deletion time $D(n) = \mathcal{O}(Q_0(n) \log^2 n + (P_0(n)/n) \log^2 n + D_0(n) \log n) = \mathcal{O}(\log^{d+2} n)$.

Plugging this in into Vaidia’s algorithm we thus obtain an $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log^{d+2} n)$ time algorithm to compute $\text{EMD}(B, R)$. \square

Earth Mover’s Distance under Translation in L_1 . The sets B and R are aligned in dimension i , or i -aligned for short, if there is a pair of points $b \in B, r \in R$ for which $b_i = r_i$. Eppstein et al. [23] show that for two point sets in \mathbb{R}^2 , there exists an optimal translation τ^* that aligns B and R in both dimensions. They explicitly consider all $\mathcal{O}((nm)^2)$ translations that both 1-align and 2-align $B + \tau$ and R . For each such a translation τ , computing an optimal matching can then be done in $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log^3 n)$ time [43], thus leading to an $\mathcal{O}(n^4 m^2 \log^3 n)$ time algorithm. We now argue that we can generalize the above result to higher dimensions.

Theorem 6.2. *Given B and R we can find an optimal translation τ^* realizing $\text{EMD}_{\text{uT}_1}(B, R)$ in $\mathcal{O}(m^d n^{d+2} \log^{d+2} n)$ time.*

Proof. Recall the definition of the cost function

$$\mathcal{D}_{B,R,1}(\phi, \tau) = \sum_{b \in B} L_1(b + \tau, \phi(b)) = \sum_{b \in B} \sum_{i=1}^d |b_i + \tau_i - \phi(b)_i|.$$

For a fixed matching ϕ , this is a piecewise linear function in τ . In particular, $\mathcal{D}_{B,R,1}(\phi, \tau)$ is a sum of piecewise linear functions $f_{b,i}(\tau) = |b_i + \tau_i - \phi(b)_i|$. For each such a function there is a hyperplane $h_{b,\phi(b),i}$ in \mathbb{R}^d given by the equation $\tau_i + b_i - \phi(b)_i = 0$, so that for a point (translation) $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^d$ on one side of (or on) the hyperplane, $f_{b,i}(\tau)$ is linear in τ (i.e. on one side we have $f(\tau) = \tau_i + b_i - \phi(b)_i$,

whereas on the other side we have $f(\tau) = -\tau_i - b_i + \phi(b)_i$. Let $H_\phi = \{h_{b,\phi(b),i} \mid b \in B, i \in \{1, \dots, d\}\}$ denote the set of all such hyperplanes, and consider the arrangement $\mathcal{A}(H_\phi)$. It follows that in each cell of $\mathcal{A}(H_\phi)$, the function $\mathcal{D}_{B,R,1}(\phi, \tau)$ is a linear function in τ , and that $\mathcal{D}_{B,R,1}(\phi, \tau)$ thus has its minimum at a vertex of $\mathcal{A}(H_\phi)$.

We extend the set of hyperplanes H_ϕ to include the hyperplane $h_{b,r,i}$ for every pair $(b, r) \in B \times R$, and every $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, rather than just the pairs $(b, \phi(b))$. Let H be the resulting set. A minimum of $\mathcal{D}_{B,R,1}(\phi, \tau)$ still occurs at a vertex of $\mathcal{A}(H)$ (as $\mathcal{A}(H)$ includes all vertices of $\mathcal{A}(H_\phi)$). Moreover, observe that H now actually contains the hyperplanes H_ϕ , for every matching $\phi \in \Phi$, so also those of an optimal matching ϕ^* . It thus follows that such a global minimum $\mathcal{D}_1(\phi^*, \tau^*)$ occurs at a vertex τ^* of $\mathcal{A}(H)$.

So, to compute an optimal matching ϕ^* and its τ^* (and thus $\text{EMDuT}(B, R)$) we can

1. explicitly compute (all vertices of) $\mathcal{A}(H)$,
2. for each such a vertex $\tau \in \mathcal{A}(H)$ (which is some candidate translation), compute an optimal matching ϕ_τ between the sets $B + \tau$ and R , and
3. report the matching (and corresponding translation) that minimizes total cost.

The set H contains mnd hyperplanes, and thus $\mathcal{A}(H)$ contains $\mathcal{O}((mnd)^d) = \mathcal{O}(m^d n^d)$ vertices. Computing $\mathcal{A}(H)$ takes $\mathcal{O}(m^d n^d)$ time [20, 21]. For each such a vertex (translation), we can compute an optimal matching in $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log^{d+2} n)$ time using the algorithm from Theorem 6.1. This thus yields an $\mathcal{O}(m^d n^{d+2} \log^{d+2} n)$ time algorithm in total. \square

EMD under translation in L_∞ . In case of the L_∞ distance, we use a similar approach as in Theorem 6.2. We prove that there is a set H of $\mathcal{O}(mnd^2)$ hyperplanes in \mathbb{R}^d , so that for any matching ϕ , there is a minimum cost translation that is a vertex of the arrangement $\mathcal{A}(H)$. We can thus again compute such an optimal matching (and the translation) by trying all $\mathcal{O}(m^d n^d)$ vertices. This yields the following result, thereby also establishing Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 6.3. *Given B and R we can find an optimal translation τ^* realizing $\text{EMDuT}_\infty(B, R)$ in $\mathcal{O}(m^d n^{d+2} \log^{d+2} n)$ time.*

Proof. We use a similar approach as in Theorem 6.2; i.e. we prove that there is a set H of $\mathcal{O}(mnd^2)$ hyperplanes in \mathbb{R}^d , so that for any matching ϕ , there is a minimum cost translation that is a vertex of the arrangement $\mathcal{A}(H)$. We can thus again compute such an optimal matching (and the translation) by trying all $\mathcal{O}(m^d n^d)$ vertices. This yields an $\mathcal{O}(m^d n^{d+2} \log^{d+2} n)$ time algorithm as claimed. What remains is to describe the set of hyperplanes H .

Fix a matching ϕ . We have

$$\mathcal{D}_{B,R,\infty}(\phi, \tau) = \sum_{b \in B} L_\infty(b + \tau, \phi(b)) = \sum_{b \in B} \max_{i=1}^d |b_i + \tau_i - \phi(b)_i|,$$

which is again a piecewise linear function in τ , as it is a sum of piecewise linear functions. Each individual function is now of the form $f_{b,r} = \max_{i=1}^d |b_i + \tau_i - r_i|$, where $b \in B$, and $r = \phi(b)$. For each such a function, there are now at most $\mathcal{O}(d)$ hyperplanes that subdivide \mathbb{R}^d into regions in which $f_{b,r}$ is given by a single linear function. In particular, the d hyperplanes given by $\tau_i - b_i + r_i = 0$, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, and $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$ hyperplanes that we get from solving $|b_i + \tau_i - r_i| = |b_j + \tau_j - r_j|$ for each $j \neq i$ (for example $\tau_i - \tau_j + b_i - b_j - r_i + r_j = 0$). Let H denote the resulting set of $\mathcal{O}(mnd^2)$ hyperplanes over all points $b \in B$, $r \in R$, and all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. It again follows that for any matching ϕ , there is a vertex of $\mathcal{A}(H)$ that corresponds to a translation τ_ϕ that minimizes $\mathcal{D}_{B,R,\infty}(\phi, \tau)$. Since this holds for an optimal matching ϕ^* , we can thus compute $\text{EMDuT}(B, R)$ in $\mathcal{O}(m^d n^{d+2} \log^{d+2} n)$ time. \square

References

- [1] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Hsien-Chih Chang, Sharath Raghvendra, and Allen Xiao. Deterministic, near-linear ε -approximation algorithm for geometric bipartite matching. In Stefano Leonardi and Anupam Gupta, editors, *STOC '22: 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, Rome, Italy, June 20 - 24, 2022*, pages 1052–1065. ACM, 2022.
- [2] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Sariel Har-Peled, Micha Sharir, and Yusu Wang. Hausdorff distance under translation for points and balls. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 6(4):71:1–71:26, 2010.
- [3] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Sharath Raghvendra, Pouyan Shirzadian, and Rachita Sowle. An Improved ε -Approximation Algorithm for Geometric Bipartite Matching. In Artur Czumaj and Qin Xin, editors, *18th Scandinavian Symposium and Workshops on Algorithm Theory, SWAT 2022, June 27-29, 2022, Tórshavn, Faroe Islands*, volume 227 of *LIPICs*, pages 6:1–6:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [4] Helmut Alt, Christian Knauer, and Carola Wenk. Matching Polygonal Curves with Respect to the Fréchet Distance. In Afonso Ferreira and Horst Reichel, editors, *STACS 2001, 18th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, Dresden, Germany, February 15-17, 2001, Proceedings*, volume 2010 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 63–74. Springer, 2001.
- [5] Arne Andersson. General balanced trees. *J. Algorithms*, 30(1):1–18, 1999.
- [6] Alexandr Andoni, Khanh Do Ba, Piotr Indyk, and David P. Woodruff. Efficient Sketches for Earth-Mover Distance, with Applications. In *50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2009, October 25-27, 2009, Atlanta, Georgia, USA*, pages 324–330. IEEE Computer Society, 2009.
- [7] Alexandr Andoni, Piotr Indyk, and Robert Krauthgamer. Earth mover distance over high-dimensional spaces. In Shang-Hua Teng, editor, *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2008, San Francisco, California, USA, January 20-22, 2008*, pages 343–352. SIAM, 2008.
- [8] Alexandr Andoni, Aleksandar Nikolov, Krzysztof Onak, and Grigory Yaroslavtsev. Parallel algorithms for geometric graph problems. In David B. Shmoys, editor, *Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2014, New York, NY, USA, May 31 - June 03, 2014*, pages 574–583. ACM, 2014.
- [9] Rinat Ben Avraham, Haim Kaplan, and Micha Sharir. A faster algorithm for the discrete Fréchet distance under translation. *CoRR*, abs/1501.03724, 2015.
- [10] Chandrajit L. Bajaj. The algebraic degree of geometric optimization problems. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 3:177–191, 1988.
- [11] Karl Bringmann, Marvin Künnemann, and André Nusser. When Lipschitz Walks Your Dog: Algorithm Engineering of the Discrete Fréchet Distance Under Translation. In Fabrizio Grandoni, Grzegorz Herman, and Peter Sanders, editors, *28th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2020, September 7-9, 2020, Pisa, Italy (Virtual Conference)*, volume 173 of *LIPICs*, pages 25:1–25:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [12] Karl Bringmann, Marvin Künnemann, and André Nusser. Discrete Fréchet Distance under Translation: Conditional Hardness and an Improved Algorithm. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 17(3):25:1–25:42, 2021.
- [13] Karl Bringmann and André Nusser. Translating Hausdorff Is Hard: Fine-Grained Lower Bounds for Hausdorff Distance Under Translation. In Kevin Buchin and Éric Colin de Verdière, editors, *37th International Symposium on Computational Geometry, SoCG 2021, June 7-11, 2021, Buffalo*,

- NY, USA (*Virtual Conference*), volume 189 of *LIPICs*, pages 18:1–18:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
- [14] Sergio Cabello, Panos Giannopoulos, Christian Knauer, and Günter Rote. Matching point sets with respect to the Earth Mover’s Distance. *Comput. Geom.*, 39(2):118–133, 2008.
- [15] Timothy M. Chan. Dynamic Generalized Closest Pair: Revisiting Eppstein’s Technique. In Martin Farach-Colton and Inge Li Gørtz, editors, *3rd Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms, SOSA 2020, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, January 6-7, 2020*, pages 33–37. SIAM, 2020.
- [16] Timothy M. Chan. Minimum L_∞ Hausdorff Distance of Point Sets Under Translation: Generalizing Klee’s Measure Problem. In Erin W. Chambers and Joachim Gudmundsson, editors, *39th International Symposium on Computational Geometry, SoCG 2023, June 12-15, 2023, Dallas, Texas, USA*, volume 258 of *LIPICs*, pages 24:1–24:13. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
- [17] Jianer Chen, Xiuzhen Huang, Iyad A. Kanj, and Ge Xia. Strong computational lower bounds via parameterized complexity. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 72(8):1346–1367, 2006.
- [18] Michael B. Cohen, Yin Tat Lee, Gary L. Miller, Jakub Pachocki, and Aaron Sidford. Geometric median in nearly linear time. In Daniel Wachs and Yishay Mansour, editors, *Proceedings of the 48th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2016, Cambridge, MA, USA, June 18-21, 2016*, pages 9–21. ACM, 2016.
- [19] Scott D. Cohen and Leonidas J. Guibas. The Earth Mover’s Distance under Transformation Sets. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Vision, Kerkyra, Corfu, Greece, September 20-25, 1999*, pages 1076–1083. IEEE Computer Society, 1999.
- [20] Mark de Berg, Otfried Cheong, Marc van Kreveld, and Mark Overmars. *Computational Geometry: Algorithms and Applications*. Springer, Berlin, 3rd edition, 2008.
- [21] Herbert Edelsbrunner, Joseph O’Rourke, and Raimund Seidel. Constructing arrangements of lines and hyperplanes with applications. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 15(2):341–363, 1986.
- [22] Jack Edmonds and Richard M Karp. Theoretical improvements in algorithmic efficiency for network flow problems. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 19(2):248–264, 1972.
- [23] David Eppstein, Marc J. van Kreveld, Bettina Speckmann, and Frank Staals. Improved grid map layout by point set matching. *Int. J. Comput. Geom. Appl.*, 25(2):101–122, 2015.
- [24] Omrit Filtser and Matthew J. Katz. Algorithms for the discrete Fréchet distance under translation. *J. Comput. Geom.*, 11(1):156–175, 2020.
- [25] Emily Fox and Jiashuai Lu. A deterministic near-linear time approximation scheme for geometric transportation. In *64th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2023, Santa Cruz, CA, USA, November 6-9, 2023*, pages 1301–1315. IEEE, 2023.
- [26] Kyle Fox and Jiashuai Lu. A near-linear time approximation scheme for geometric transportation with arbitrary supplies and spread. *J. Comput. Geom.*, 13(1), 2022.
- [27] Daniel P. Huttenlocher and Klara Kedem. Computing the Minimum Hausdorff Distance for Point Sets Under Translation. In Raimund Seidel, editor, *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry, Berkeley, CA, USA, June 6-8, 1990*, pages 340–349. ACM, 1990.
- [28] Daniel P. Huttenlocher, William Rucklidge, and Gregory A. Klanderman. Comparing images using the Hausdorff distance under translation. In *IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 1992, Proceedings, 15-18 June, 1992, Champaign, Illinois, USA*, pages 654–656. IEEE, 1992.

- [29] Russell Impagliazzo and Ramamohan Paturi. On the Complexity of k-SAT. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 62(2):367–375, 2001.
- [30] Piotr Indyk. A near linear time constant factor approximation for Euclidean bichromatic matching (cost). In Nikhil Bansal, Kirk Pruhs, and Clifford Stein, editors, *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2007, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, January 7-9, 2007*, pages 39–42. SIAM, 2007.
- [31] Minghui Jiang, Ying Xu, and Binhai Zhu. Protein Structure-structure Alignment with Discrete Fréchet Distance. *J. Bioinform. Comput. Biol.*, 6(1):51–64, 2008.
- [32] Andrey Boris Khesin, Aleksandar Nikolov, and Dmitry Paramonov. Preconditioning for the geometric transportation problem. *J. Comput. Geom.*, 11(2):234–259, 2020.
- [33] Oliver Klein and Remco C. Veltkamp. Approximation algorithms for the Earth mover’s distance under transformations using reference points. In *(Informal) Proceedings of the 21st European Workshop on Computational Geometry, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, March 9-11, 2005*, pages 53–56. Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, 2005.
- [34] Christian Knauer, Klaus Kriegel, and Fabian Stehn. Minimizing the weighted directed Hausdorff distance between colored point sets under translations and rigid motions. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 412(4-5):375–382, 2011.
- [35] Christian Knauer and Marc Scherfenberg. Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search under Translation Invariant Hausdorff Distance. *Int. J. Comput. Geom. Appl.*, 21(3):369–381, 2011.
- [36] Harold W Kuhn. The hungarian method for the assignment problem. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 2(1-2):83–97, 1955.
- [37] Axel Mosig and Michael Clausen. Approximately matching polygonal curves with respect to the Fréchet distance. *Comput. Geom.*, 30(2):113–127, 2005.
- [38] Mark H. Overmars and Jan van Leeuwen. Maintenance of configurations in the plane. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 23(2):166–204, 1981.
- [39] Franco P Preparata and Michael I Shamos. *Computational geometry: an introduction*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [40] Dhruv Rohatgi. Conditional Hardness of Earth Mover Distance. In Dimitris Achlioptas and László A. Végh, editors, *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques, APPROX/RANDOM 2019, September 20-22, 2019, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA*, volume 145 of *LIPICs*, pages 12:1–12:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019.
- [41] Günter Rote. Computing the Minimum Hausdorff Distance Between Two Point Sets on a Line Under Translation. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 38(3):123–127, 1991.
- [42] Yossi Rubner, Carlo Tomasi, and Leonidas J. Guibas. The Earth Mover’s Distance as a Metric for Image Retrieval. *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, 40(2):99–121, 2000.
- [43] Pravin M. Vaidya. Geometry helps in matching. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 18(6):1201–1225, 1989.
- [44] Virginia Vassilevska-Williams. On Some Fine-Grained Questions in Algorithms and Complexity. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (ICM 2018)*, pages 3447–34, 2018.
- [45] Ryan Williams. A new algorithm for optimal 2-constraint satisfaction and its implications. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 348(2-3):357–365, 2005.