

ON THE TWO-DIMENSIONAL KNAPSACK PROBLEM FOR CONVEX POLYGONS

ARTURO MERINO AND ANDREAS WIESE

ABSTRACT. We study the two-dimensional geometric knapsack problem for convex polygons. Given a set of weighted convex polygons and a square knapsack, the goal is to select the most profitable subset of the given polygons that fits non-overlappingly into the knapsack. We allow to rotate the polygons by arbitrary angles. We present a quasi-polynomial time $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for the general case and a polynomial time $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm if all input polygons are triangles, both assuming polynomially bounded integral input data. Also, we give a quasi-polynomial time algorithm that computes a solution of optimal weight under resource augmentation, i.e., we allow to increase the size of the knapsack by a factor of $1 + \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$ but compare ourselves with the optimal solution for the original knapsack. To the best of our knowledge, these are the first results for two-dimensional geometric knapsack in which the input objects are more general than axis-parallel rectangles or circles and in which the input polygons can be rotated by arbitrary angles.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the two-dimensional geometric knapsack problem (2DKP) we are given a square knapsack $K := [0, N] \times [0, N]$ for some integer N and a set of n convex polygons \mathcal{P} where each polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ has a weight $w_i > 0$; we write $w(\mathcal{P}') := \sum_{P_i \in \mathcal{P}'} w_i$ for any set $\mathcal{P}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}$. The goal is to select a subset $\mathcal{P}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ of maximum total weight $w(\mathcal{P}')$ such that the polygons in \mathcal{P}' fit non-overlapping into K if we translate and rotate them suitably (by arbitrary angles). 2DKP is a natural packing problem, the reader may think of cutting items out of a piece of raw material like metal or wood, cutting cookings out of dough, or, in three dimensions, loading cargo into a ship or a truck. In particular, in these applications the respective items can have various kinds of shapes. Also note that 2DKP is a natural geometric generalization of the classical one-dimensional knapsack problem.

Our understanding of 2DKP highly depends on the type of input objects. If all polygons are axis-parallel squares there is a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation with a running time of the form $O_\epsilon(1)n^{O(1)}$ (i.e., an EPTAS) [HW19], and there can be no FPTAS (unless $P = NP$) since the problem is strongly NP-hard [LTW⁺90]. For axis-parallel rectangles there is a polynomial time $(17/9 + \epsilon) < 1.89$ -approximation algorithm and a $(3/2 + \epsilon)$ -approximation if the items can be rotated by exactly 90 degrees [GGH⁺17]. If the input data is quasi-polynomially bounded there is even a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation in quasi-polynomial time [AW15], with and without the possibility to rotate items by 90 degrees. For circles a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation is known under resource augmentation in one dimension if the weight of each circle equals its area [LMX18].

To the best of our knowledge, there is no result known for 2DKP for shapes different than axis-parallel rectangles and circles. Also, there is no result known in which input polygons are

(Arturo Merino) TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN, GERMANY,

(Andreas Wiese) UNIVERSIDAD DE CHILE, CHILE,

E-mail addresses: merino@math.tu-berlin.de, awiese@dii.uchile.cl.

Andreas Wiese: partially supported by FONDECYT Regular grant 1170223. Arturo Merino: partially supported by DFG Project 413902284 and ANID Becas Chile 2019-72200522.

allowed to be rotated by angles different than 90 degrees. However, in the applications of 2DKP the items might have shapes that are more complicated than rectangles or circles. Also, it makes sense to allow rotations by arbitrary angles, e.g., when cutting items out of some material. In this paper, we present the first results for 2DKP in these settings.

1.1. Our contribution. We study 2DKP for arbitrary convex polygons, allowing to rotate them by arbitrary angles. Note that due to the latter, it might be that some optimal solution places the vertices of the polygons on irrational coordinates, even if all input numbers are integers. Our first results are a quasi-polynomial time $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for general convex polygons and a polynomial time $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for triangles.

By rotation we can assume for each input polygon that the line segment defining its diameter is horizontal. We identify three different types of polygons for which we employ different strategies for packing them, see Figure 1a). First, we consider the *easy* polygons which are the polygons whose bounding boxes fit into the knapsack without rotation. We pack these polygons such that their bounding boxes do not intersect. Using area arguments and the Steinberg's algorithm [Ste97] we obtain a $O(1)$ -approximation for the easy polygons. Then we consider the *medium* polygons which are the polygons whose bounding boxes easily fit into the knapsack if we can rotate them by 45 degrees. We use a special type of packing in which the bounding boxes are rotated by 45 degrees and then stacked on top of each other, see Figure 1b). More precisely, we group the polygons by the widths of their bounding boxes and to each group we assign two rectangular containers in the packing. We compute the essentially optimal solution of this type by solving a generalization of one-dimensional knapsack for each group. Our key structural insight for medium polygons is that such a solution is $O(1)$ -approximate. To this end, we prove that in OPT the medium polygons of each group occupy an area that is by at most a constant factor bigger than the corresponding containers, and that a constant fraction of these polygons fit into the containers. In particular, we show that medium polygons with very wide bounding boxes lie in a very small hexagonal area close to the diagonal of the knapsack. Our routines for easy and medium polygons run in polynomial time.

It remains to pack the *hard* polygons whose bounding boxes just fit into the knapsack or do not fit at all, even under rotation. Note that this does not imply that the polygon itself does not fit. Our key insight is that there can be only $O(\log N)$ such polygons in the optimal solution, at most $O(1)$ from each group. Therefore, we can guess these polygons in quasi-polynomial time, assuming that N is quasi-polynomially bounded. However, in contrast to other packing problems, it is not trivial to check whether a set of given polygons fits into the knapsack since we can rotate them by arbitrary angles and we cannot enumerate all possibilities for the angles. However, we show that by losing a constant factor in the approximation guarantee we can assume that the placement of each hard polygon comes from a precomputable polynomial size set and hence we can guess the placements of the $O(\log N)$ hard polygons in quasi-polynomial time.

Theorem 1. *There is a $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for 2DKP with a running time of $(nN)^{(\log nN)^{O(1)}}$.*

If all hard polygons are triangles we present even a *polynomial* time $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm. We split the triangles in OPT into two types, for one type we show that a constant fraction of it can be packed in what we call *top-left-packings*, see Figure 1b). In these packings, the triangles are sorted by the lengths of their longest edges and placed on top of each other in a triangular area. We devise a dynamic program (DP) that essentially computes the most profitable top-left-packing. For proving that this yields a $O(1)$ -approximation, we need some careful arguments for rearranging a subset of the triangles with large weight to obtain a packing




FIGURE 1. (a) An easy, a medium, and a hard polygon and their bounding boxes (b): Triangles packed in a top-left packing (c) The geometric DP subdivides the knapsack along the dashed lines and then recurses within each resulting area.




FIGURE 2. Left: Assume that the polygon (black line segments) is a medium polygon contained in the set \mathcal{P}_j . Then the diagonal (dashed) line segment must lie into the dark-gray area and the whole polygon must be contained in the light-gray area. Right: The containers for the medium polygons of the different groups. Within each container, the polygons are stacked on top of each other such that their respective bounding boxes do not intersect.

that our DP can compute. We observe that essentially all hard polygons in OPT must intersect the horizontal line that contains the mid-point of the knapsack. Our key insight is that if we pack a triangle in a top-left-packing then it intersects this line to a similar extent as in OPT. Then we derive a sufficient condition when a set of triangles fits in a top-left-packing, based on by how much they overlap this line.

For the other type of triangles we use a geometric dynamic program. In this DP we recursively subdivide the knapsack into subareas in which we search for the optimal solution recursively, see Figure 1c). In the process we guess the placements of some triangles from OPT. Again, by losing a constant factor we can assume that for each triangle in OPT there are only a polynomial number of possible placements. By exploiting structural properties of this type of triangles we ensure that the number of needed DP-cells is bounded by a polynomial. A key difficulty is that we sometimes split the knapsack into two parts on which we recurse independently. Then we need to ensure that we do not select some (possibly high weight) triangle in both parts. To this end, we globally select at most one triangle from each of the $O(\log N)$ groups (losing a constant

factor) and when we recurse, we guess for each subproblem from which of the $O(\log N)$ groups it contains a triangle in OPT. This yields only $2^{O(\log N)} = N^{O(1)}$ guesses.

Theorem 2. *There is a $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for 2DKP with a running time of $(nN)^{O(1)}$ if all input polygons are triangles.*

Then we study the setting of resource augmentation, i.e., we compute a solution that fits into a larger knapsack of size $(1 + \delta)N \times (1 + \delta)N$ for some constant $\delta > 0$ and compare ourselves with a solution that fits into the original knapsack of size $N \times N$. We show that then the optimal solution can contain only *constantly* many hard polygons and hence we can guess them in *polynomial* time.

Theorem 3. *There is a $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for 2DKP under $(1 + \delta)$ -resource augmentation with a running time of $n^{O_\delta(1)}$.*

Finally, we present a quasi-polynomial time algorithm that computes a solution of weight at least $w(\text{OPT})$ (i.e., we do not lose any factor in the approximation guarantee) that is feasible under resource augmentation. This algorithm does not use the above classification of polygons into easy, medium, and hard polygons. Instead, we prove that if we can increase the size of the knapsack slightly we can ensure that for the input polygons there are only $(\log n)^{O_\delta(1)}$ different shapes by enlarging the polygons suitably. Also, we show that we need to allow only a polynomial number of possible placements and rotations for each input polygon, *without* sacrificing any polygons from OPT. Then we use a technique from [AW14] implying that there is a balanced separator for the polygons in OPT with only $(\log n)^{O_\delta(1)}$ edges and which intersects polygons from OPT with only very small area. We guess the separator, guess how many polygons of each type are placed inside and outside the separator, and then recurse on each of these parts. Some polygons are intersected by the balanced separator. However, we ensure that they have very small area in total and hence we can place them into the additional space of the knapsack that we gain due to the resource augmentation. This generalizes a result in [AW15] for axis-parallel rectangles.

Theorem 4. *There is an algorithm for 2DKP under $(1 + \delta)$ -resource augmentation with a running time of $n^{O_\delta(\log n)^{O(1)}}$ that computes a solution of weight at least $w(\text{OPT})$.*

In our approximation algorithms, we focus on a clean exposition of our methodology for obtaining $O(1)$ -approximations, rather than on optimizing the actual approximation ratio.

1.2. Other related work. Prior to the results mentioned above, polynomial time $(2 + \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithms for 2DKP for axis-parallel rectangles were presented by Jansen and Zhang [JZ04b, JZ04a]. For the same setting, a PTAS is known under resource augmentation in one dimension [JSO07] and a polynomial time algorithm computing a solution with optimum weight under resource augmentation in both dimensions [HW19]. Also, there is a PTAS if the weight of each rectangle equals its area [BCJ⁺09]. For squares, Jansen and Solis-Oba presented a PTAS [JSO08].

2. CONSTANT FACTOR APPROXIMATION ALGORITHMS

In this section we present our quasi-polynomial time $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for general convex polygons and our polynomial time $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for triangles, assuming polynomially bounded input data. Our strategy is to partition the input polygons \mathcal{P} into three classes, easy, medium, and hard polygons, and then to devise algorithms for each class separately.

Let $K := [0, N] \times [0, N]$ denote the given knapsack. We assume that each input polygon is described by the coordinates of its vertices which we assume to be integral. First, we rotate each polygon in \mathcal{P} such that its longest diagonal (i.e., the line segment that connects the two vertices of largest distance) is horizontal. For each polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ denote by $(x_{i,1}, y_{i,1}), \dots, (x_{i,k_i}, y_{i,k_i})$ the new coordinates of its vertices. Observe that due to the rotation, the resulting coordinates might not be integral, and possibly not even rational. We will take this into account when we define our algorithms. For each $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ we define its *bounding box* B_i to be the smallest axis-parallel rectangle that contains P_i . Formally, we define $B_i := [\min_{\ell} x_{i,\ell}, \max_{\ell} x_{i,\ell}] \times [\min_{\ell} y_{i,\ell}, \max_{\ell} y_{i,\ell}]$. For each polygon P_i let $\ell_i := \max_{\ell} x_{i,\ell} - \min_{\ell} x_{i,\ell}$ and $h_i := \max_{\ell} y_{i,\ell} - \min_{\ell} y_{i,\ell}$. If necessary we will work with suitable estimates of these values later, considering that they might be irrational and hence we cannot compute them exactly.

We first distinguish the input polygons into *easy*, *medium*, and *hard* polygons. We say that a polygon P_i is *easy* if B_i fits into K without rotation, i.e., such that $\ell_i \leq N$ and $h_i \leq N$. Denote by $\mathcal{P}_E \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ the set of easy polygons. Note that the bounding box of a polygon in $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}_E$ might still fit into K if we rotate it suitably. Intuitively, we define the medium polygons to be the polygons P_i whose bounding box B_i fits into K with quite some slack if we rotate B_i properly and the hard polygons are the remaining polygons (in particular those polygons whose bounding box does not fit at all into K).

Formally, for each polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ we define $h'_i := \sqrt{2}N - \ell_i$. The intuition for h'_i is that a rectangle of width ℓ_i and height h'_i is the highest rectangle of width ℓ_i that still fits into K .

Lemma 5. *Let $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$. A rectangle of width ℓ_i and height h'_i fits into K (if we rotate it by 45°) but a rectangle of width ℓ_i and of height larger than h'_i does not fit into K .*

Proof. We begin by proving that the rectangle $R_i = [0, \ell_i] \times [0, h'_i]$ fits into K when rotating by 45° . To this end, just consider the placement of R_i by its new vertices $v_1 = (\frac{h'_i}{\sqrt{2}}, 0)$, $v_2 = (N, \frac{\ell_i}{\sqrt{2}})$, $v_3 = (N - \frac{h'_i}{\sqrt{2}}, N)$, $v_4 = (0, N - \frac{\ell_i}{\sqrt{2}})$.

We now prove the second part of the Lemma. Choose $\delta \geq 0$ maximal such that $R_i^\delta := [0, \ell_i] \times [0, h'_i + \delta]$ fits into K . We aim to prove that $\delta = 0$. By maximality of δ we can assume that in the placement into K some vertex of R_i^δ lies on a side of K . Without loss of generality we assume that v_1 lies on $[0, N] \times \{0\}$. Therefore $v_1 = (t, 0)$ for some $t \in [0, N]$. Draw the two lines that start in v_1 and have 45° difference with the side $[0, N] \times \{0\}$. Note that these lines intersect K at $p_1 := (0, t)$ and $p_2 := (N, N - t)$, additionally $\|v_1 - v_2\| = \sqrt{2}t$ and $\|v_1 - v_3\| = \sqrt{2}(N - t)$. Since R_i^δ fits, these are also upper bounds on ℓ_i and $h'_i + \delta$ respectively. We conclude that $\ell_i \leq \sqrt{2}t$ and therefore:

$$\sqrt{2}N - \ell_i + \delta = h'_i + \delta \leq \sqrt{2}(N - t) \leq \sqrt{2}N - \ell_i,$$

concluding that $\delta = 0$ and the proof of the Lemma. \square

Hence, if h_i is much smaller than h'_i then B_i fits into K with quite some slack. Therefore, we define that a polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}_E$ is *medium* if $h_i \leq h'_i/8$ and *hard* otherwise. Denote by $\mathcal{P}_M \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}_H \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ the medium and hard polygons, respectively. We will present $O(1)$ -approximation algorithms for each of the sets $\mathcal{P}_E, \mathcal{P}_M, \mathcal{P}_H$ separately. The best of the computed sets will then yield a $O(1)$ -approximation overall.

For the easy polygons, we construct a polynomial time $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm in which we select polygons such that we can pack their bounding boxes as non-overlapping rectangles using Steinberg's algorithm [CGJT80], see Section 2.1. The approximation ratio follows from area arguments.

Lemma 6. *There is a polynomial time algorithm that computes a solution $\mathcal{P}'_E \subseteq \mathcal{P}_E$ with $w(\text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{P}_E) \leq O(w(\mathcal{P}'_E))$.*

For the medium polygons, we obtain a $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm using a different packing strategy, see Section 2.2.

Lemma 7. *There is an algorithm with a running time of $n^{O(1)}$ that computes a solution $\mathcal{P}'_M \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M$ with $w(\text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{P}_M) \leq O(w(\mathcal{P}'_M))$.*

The most difficult polygons are the hard polygons. First, we show that in quasi-polynomial time we can obtain a $O(1)$ -approximation for them, see Section 2.3.

Lemma 8. *There is an algorithm with a running time of $(nN)^{(\log nN)^{O(1)}}$ that computes a solution $\mathcal{P}'_H \subseteq \mathcal{P}_H$ with $w(\text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{P}_H) \leq O(w(\mathcal{P}'_H))$.*

Combining Lemmas 6, 7, and 8 yields Theorem 1. If all polygons are triangles, we obtain a $O(1)$ -approximation even in polynomial time. The following lemma is proved in Section 2.4 and together with Lemmas 6 and 7 implies Theorem 2.

Lemma 9. *If all input polygons are triangles, then there is an algorithm with a running time of $(nN)^{O(1)}$ that computes a solution $\mathcal{P}'_H \subseteq \mathcal{P}_H$ with $w(\text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{P}_H) \leq O(w(\mathcal{P}'_H))$.*

Orthogonal to the characterization into easy, medium and hard polygons, we subdivide the polygons in \mathcal{P} further into classes according to the respective values ℓ_i . More precisely, we do this according to their difference between ℓ_i and the diameter of K , i.e., $\sqrt{2}N$. Formally, for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ we define $\mathcal{P}_j := \{P_i \in \mathcal{P} \mid \ell_i \in [\sqrt{2}N - 2^j, \sqrt{2}N - 2^{j-1}]\}$ and additionally $\mathcal{P}_{-\infty} := \{P_i \in \mathcal{P} \mid \ell_i = \sqrt{2}N\}$. Note that for each polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ we can compute the group \mathcal{P}_j even though ℓ_i might be irrational.

2.1. Easy polygons. We present a $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for the polygons in \mathcal{P}_E . First, we show that the area of each polygon is at least half of the area of its bounding box. We will use this later for defining lower bounds using area arguments.

Lemma 10. *For each $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ it holds that $\text{area}(P_i) \geq \frac{1}{2}\text{area}(B_i)$.*

Proof. If P_i is a triangle the result is clear. Suppose that P_i has more than three sides and call D its longest diagonal. Split P_i into two polygons P, Q by D . Call T_P and T_Q the triangles formed by D and the vertices further away from D in P and Q respectively. By convexity we know that $T_P \subseteq P$ and $T_Q \subseteq Q$. We conclude by noting that $\frac{1}{2}\text{area}(B_i) = \text{area}(T_P \cup T_Q) \leq \text{area}(P \cup Q) = \text{area}(P_i)$. \square

On the other hand, it is known that we can pack any set of axis-parallel rectangles into K , as long as their total area is at most $\text{area}(K)/2$ and each single rectangle fits into K .

Theorem 11 ([Ste97]). *Let r_1, \dots, r_k be a set of axis-parallel rectangles such that $\sum_{i=1}^k \text{area}(r_i) \leq \text{area}(K)/2$ and each individual rectangle r_i fits into K . Then there is a polynomial time algorithm that packs r_1, \dots, r_k into K .*

We first compute (essentially) the most profitable set of polygons from \mathcal{P}_E whose total area is at most $\text{area}(K)$ via a reduction to one-dimensional knapsack.

Lemma 12. *In time $(\frac{n}{\epsilon})^{O(1)}$ we can compute a set of polygons $\mathcal{P}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}_E$ such that $w(\mathcal{P}') \geq (1 - \epsilon)w(\text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{P}_E)$ and $\sum_{P_i \in \mathcal{P}'} \text{area}(P_i) \leq \text{area}(K)$.*

Proof. We define an instance of one-dimensional knapsack with a set of items I where we introduce for each polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_E$ an item $a_i \in I$ with size $s_i := \text{area}(P_i)$ and profit $p_i := w_i$ and define the size of the knapsack to be $\text{area}(K)$. We apply the FPTAS in [Jin19] on this instance and obtain a set of items $I' \subseteq I$ such that $p(I') := \sum_{i \in I'} p_i \geq (1 - \epsilon)\text{OPT}(I)$ where $\text{OPT}(I)$ denote the optimal solution for the set of items I , given a knapsack of size $\text{area}(K)$. We define $\mathcal{P}' := \{P_i \in \mathcal{P}_E | a_i \in I'\}$. \square

The idea is now to partition \mathcal{P}' into at most 7 sets $\mathcal{P}'_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}'_7$. Hence, one of these sets must contain at least a profit of $w(\mathcal{P}')/7$. We define this partition such that each set \mathcal{P}'_j contains only one polygon or its polygons have a total area of at most $\text{area}(K)/4$.

Lemma 13. *Given a set $\mathcal{P}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}_E$ with $\sum_{P_i \in \mathcal{P}_E} \text{area}(P_i) \leq \text{area}(K)$. In polynomial time we can compute a set $\mathcal{P}'' \subseteq \mathcal{P}'$ with $w(\mathcal{P}'') \geq \frac{1}{7}w(\mathcal{P}')$ and additionally $\sum_{P_i \in \mathcal{P}''} \text{area}(P_i) \leq \text{area}(K)/4$ or $|\mathcal{P}''| = 1$.*

Proof. Note that every set of rectangles that fit into the Knapsack with total area less than $\frac{1}{2}\text{area}(K)$ can be packed into the Knapsack by Theorem 11. Therefore, any set polygons of total area less than $\frac{1}{4}\text{area}(K)$ can be put into their bounding boxes and, since the total area of these boxes has at most doubled, the convex polygons can be packed accordingly. Moreover if the height and width of the bounding box can be computed in polynomial time, this placement can also be computed in polynomial time.

Sort $\mathcal{P}' = \{P'_1, \dots, P'_l\}$ decreasingly by area and define $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{P'_1\}$, $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{P'_2\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_3 = \{P'_3\}$. We now partition $\mathcal{P}' \setminus \{\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_3\}$ obtaining parts $\mathcal{C}_4, \dots, \mathcal{C}_p$ as follows. We begin by defining a sequence of ℓ_j :

$$\ell_0 = 0, \\ \ell_j = \max \left\{ k \in \{\ell_{j-1}, \dots, \ell\} : \sum_{i=\ell_{j-1}+1}^k \text{area}(P'_i) \leq \frac{1}{4}\text{area}(K) \right\},$$

and consider the partition of $\mathcal{P}' \setminus \{\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_3\}$ into parts of the form $\{c'_{\ell_j+1}, \dots, c'_{\ell_{j+1}}\}$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $p \geq 8$. Note that $\sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}_i} \text{area}(C) \geq \frac{1}{4}\text{area}(K) - \text{area}(P'_3)$ for each i such that $4 \leq i < p$, therefore:

$$\text{area}(K) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}_i} \text{area}(C) \geq 3 \cdot \text{area}(P'_3) + \sum_{i=4}^{p-1} \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}_i} \text{area}(C) \geq \\ 3 \cdot \text{area}(P'_3) + (p-4) \left(\frac{\text{area}(K)}{4} - \text{area}(P'_3) \right) > \text{area}(K),$$

arriving at a contradiction. Pick \mathcal{P}'' the part with largest weight, therefore $w(\mathcal{P}'') \geq \frac{1}{7}w(\mathcal{P}')$ and, by construction, either \mathcal{P}'' is a single polygon that fits or has area at most $\frac{1}{4}\text{area}(K)$ and can be placed non-overlappingly into the Knapsack. \square

If $|\mathcal{P}''| = 1$ we simply pack the single polygon in \mathcal{P}'' into the knapsack. Otherwise, using Lemmas 10 and 12 and Theorem 11 we know that we can pack the bounding boxes of the polygons in \mathcal{P}'' into K . Note that their heights and widths might be irrational. Therefore, we slightly increase them such that these values become rational, before applying Theorem 11 to compute the actual packing. If as a result the total area of the bounding boxes exceeds $\text{area}(K)/2$ we partition them into two sets where each set satisfies that the total area of the bounding boxes is at most $\text{area}(K)/2$ or it contains only one polygon and we keep the more

profitable of these two sets (hence losing a factor of 2 in the approximation ratio). This yields a $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for the easy polygons and thus proves Lemma 6.

2.2. Medium polygons. We describe a $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for the polygons in \mathcal{P}_M . In its solution, for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ we will define two rectangular containers R_j, R'_j for polygons in $\mathcal{P}_M \cap \mathcal{P}_j$, each of them having width $\sqrt{2}N - 2^{j-1}$ and height 2^{j-3} , see Figures 2. Let $\mathcal{R} := \cup_j \{R_j, R'_j\}$. First, we show that we can pack all containers in \mathcal{R} into K (if we rotate them by 45°).

Lemma 14. *The rectangles in \mathcal{R} can be packed non-overlappingly into K .*

Proof. Let j^* be the largest integer such that $\sqrt{2}N - 2^{j^*-1} > 0$. For $j \leq j^*$ we place the rectangle R_j such that its vertices are at the following coordinates: $(\frac{2^{j-1}}{\sqrt{2}}, N)$, $(N, \frac{2^{j-1}}{\sqrt{2}})$, $(N - \frac{2^{j-3}}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{3}{\sqrt{2}}2^{j-3})$, $(\frac{3}{\sqrt{2}}2^{j-3}, N - \frac{2^{j-3}}{\sqrt{2}})$. Note that since:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left(\frac{2^{j-1}}{\sqrt{2}}, N \right) - \left(N, \frac{2^{j-1}}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \right\|_2 &= \sqrt{2}N - 2^{j-1}, \\ \left\| \left(N - \frac{2^{j-3}}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{3}{\sqrt{2}}2^{j-3} \right) - \left(N, \frac{2^{j-1}}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \right\|_2 &= 2^{j-3}, \end{aligned}$$

this is indeed the rectangle R_j .

To prove that these are placed non-overlappingly, we define a family of hyperplanes $\{H_j\}_{j \leq j^*}$ such that for each j , R_j and R_{j-1} are in different half-spaces defined by H_j . Define these half-spaces as:

$$\begin{aligned} H_j^- &= \left\{ (x, y) \in [0, N]^2 : x + y = N + \frac{2^{j-2}}{\sqrt{2}} \right\}, \\ H_j^< &= \left\{ (x, y) \in [0, N]^2 : x + y \leq N + \frac{2^{j-2}}{\sqrt{2}} \right\}, \\ H_j^> &= \left\{ (x, y) \in [0, N]^2 : x + y \geq N + \frac{2^{j-2}}{\sqrt{2}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $R_{j+1} \subseteq H_j^>$ and $R_j \subseteq H_j^<$. Therefore, if $i < j$ we have that $R_j \subseteq H_j^<$ and $R_i \subseteq H_{i-1}^> \subseteq H_j^>$, making this a non-overlapping packing.

Noting that the rectangles $\{R_j\}_{j \leq j^*}$ are packed in the half-space $H^+ = \{(x, y) \in [0, N]^2 : x + y \geq N\}$, we can pack the rectangles $\{R'_j\}_{j \leq j^*}$ symmetrically. \square

For each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ we will compute a set of polygons $\mathcal{P}'_j \subseteq \mathcal{P}_M \cap \mathcal{P}_j$ of large weight. Within each container R_j, R'_j we will stack the bounding boxes of the polygons in \mathcal{P}'_j on top of each other and then place the polygons in \mathcal{P}'_j in their respective bounding boxes, see Figure 2. In particular, a set of items $\mathcal{P}''_j \subseteq \mathcal{P}_j$ fits into R_j (or R'_j) using this strategy if and only if $h(\mathcal{P}''_j) := \sum_{P_i \in \mathcal{P}''_j} h_i \leq 2^{j-3}$. Observe that for a polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_j$ with $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_H$ it is not necessarily true that $h_i \leq 2^{j-3}$ and hence for hard polygons this strategy is not suitable. We compute the essentially most profitable set of items \mathcal{P}'_j that fits into R_j and R'_j with the above strategy. For this, we need to solve a variation of one-dimensional knapsack with two knapsacks (instead of one) that represent R_j and R'_j . The value h_i for a polygon P_i might be irrational, therefore we work with a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -estimate of h_i instead. This costs only a factor $O(1)$ in the approximation guarantee.

Lemma 15. *Let $\epsilon > 0$. For each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ there is an algorithm with a running time of $n^{O(\frac{1}{\epsilon})}$ that computes two disjoint sets $\mathcal{P}'_{j,1}, \mathcal{P}'_{j,2} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_M$ such that $h(\mathcal{P}'_{j,1}) \leq 2^{j-3}$ and $h(\mathcal{P}'_{j,2}) \leq 2^{j-3}$*

and $w(\mathcal{P}_{j,1}^* \cup \mathcal{P}_{j,2}^*) \leq O(w(\mathcal{P}_{j,1}' \cup \mathcal{P}_{j,2}'))$ for any disjoint sets $\mathcal{P}_{j,1}^*, \mathcal{P}_{j,2}^* \subseteq \mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_M$ such that $h(\mathcal{P}_{j,1}^*) \leq 2^{j-3}$ and $h(\mathcal{P}_{j,2}^*) \leq 2^{j-3}$.

Proof. First, for each polygon P_i we compute an estimate for h_i that overestimates the true value for h_i by at most a factor $1 + \epsilon$. Working with this estimate instead of the real value for h_i loses at most a factor of $O(1)$ in the profit.

For each j , note that we aim to solve a variation of one-dimensional knapsack with two identical knapsacks instead of one. In our setting we have two knapsacks K_1 and K_2 , each with capacity 2^{j-3} , the set of objects to choose from are $\mathcal{I} := \mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_M$ and each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ has size h_i and profit w_i . This can be done with the algorithm in [CK00]. \square

For each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_M \neq \emptyset$ we apply Lemma 15 and obtain sets $\mathcal{P}_{j,1}', \mathcal{P}_{j,2}'$. We pack $\mathcal{P}_{j,1}'$ into R_j and $\mathcal{P}_{j,2}'$ into R_j' , using that $h(\mathcal{P}_{j,1}') \leq h(R_j)$ and $h(\mathcal{P}_{j,2}') \leq h(R_j')$. Then we pack all containers R_j, R_j' for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ into K , using Lemma 14.

Let $\mathcal{P}_M' := \bigcup_j \mathcal{P}_{j,1}' \cup \mathcal{P}_{j,2}'$ denote the selected polygons. We want to show that \mathcal{P}_M' has large weight; more precisely we want to show that $w(\text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{P}_M) \leq O(w(\mathcal{P}_M'))$. First, we show that for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ the polygons in $\mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_M \cap \text{OPT}$ have bounded area. To this end, we show that they are contained inside a certain (irregular) hexagon (see Figure 2) which has small area if the polygons $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_j$ are wide, i.e., if ℓ_i is close to $\sqrt{2}N$. The reason is that then P_i must be placed close to the diagonal of the knapsack and on the other hand h_i is relatively small (since P_i is medium), which implies that all of P_i lies close to the diagonal of the knapsack. For any object $O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ we define $\text{area}(O)$ to be its area.

Lemma 16. *For each j it holds that $\text{area}(\mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_M) \leq O(\text{area}(R_j \cup R_j'))$.*

Proof. We show that we can choose a constant C_j such that if a polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_M$ is placed in the knapsack, then it is contained in the (irregular) hexagon $H_{1,j}$ that we define to be the hexagon with vertices $(0, 0), (0, C_j), (N, N - C_j), (N, N), (N - C_j, N), (C_j, 0)$, or in the (irregular) hexagon $H_{2,j}$ that we define to be the hexagon with vertices $(0, N - C_j), (0, N), (C_j, N), (N - C_j, 0), (N, 0), (N, C_j)$, see Figure 2. To prove this, we first show that in the placement of P_i inside K the vertices of the longest diagonal of P_i essentially lie near opposite corners of K . We then use this to show that this longest diagonal of P_i lies inside one of two hexagons that are even smaller than $H_{1,j}$ and $H_{2,j}$, respectively, see Figure 2. If additionally $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_M$ we conclude that P_i is placed completely within $H_{1,j} \cup H_{2,j}$ (while if $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_H$ the latter is not necessarily true).

Given a value $r \geq 0$ we define $T_1(r)$ as the union of the triangles with vertices $(0, r), (r, 0), (0, 0)$ and $(N - r, N), (N, N - r), (N, N)$ and $H_1(r) := \text{conv}(T_1(r))$. Note that $H_{1,j} = H_1(C_j)$. Similarly, we define $T_2(r)$ as the union of the triangles with vertices $(0, N - r), (0, N), (r, N)$ and $(N - r, 0), (N, 0), (N, r)$ and $H_2(r) := \text{conv}(T_2(r))$, noting that $H_{2,j} = H_2(C_j)$.

Claim. Consider a polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_j$. Let P be a placement of P_i inside K and let $D = \overline{v^1 v^2}$ denote the longest diagonal of P for two vertices v^1, v^2 of P . Define $r_i := N - \sqrt{\ell_i^2 - N^2}$. If $H_1(r_i) \cup H_2(r_i) \neq K$ then it holds that $D \subseteq H_1(r_i)$ or $D \subseteq H_2(r_i)$. If additionally $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_M$ then $P \subseteq H_1(r_i + \sqrt{2}2^{j-3})$ or $P \subseteq H_2(r_i + \sqrt{2}2^{j-3})$.

Proof of claim. We can assume that $r_i < N - r_i$ since otherwise $H_1(r_i) \cup H_2(r_i) = K$. Call H the polygon with vertices $(0, r_i), (r_i, 0), (N - r_i, N), (N, N - r_i), (0, N - r_i), (r_i, N), (N - r_i, 0), (N, r_i)$. Note that since H is a polyhedron, its diameter is given by the two vertices furthest apart.

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{diam}(H) &= \max \left\{ \sqrt{N^2 + (N - 2r_i)^2}, \sqrt{(N - r_i)^2 + (N - r_i)^2} \right\} \\
&\leq \sqrt{N^2 + (N - r_i)^2} \\
&= \sqrt{N^2 + (\ell_i^2 - N^2)} \\
&= \ell_i
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $v^1 \in T_1(r_i) \cup T_2(r_i)$ or $v^2 \in T_1(r_i) \cup T_2(r_i)$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $v^1 \in T_1(r_i) \cup T_2(r_i)$. Furthermore, assume that $v^1 \in T_1(r_i)$ and assume w.l.o.g. that v^1 is contained in the triangle with vertices $(0, r_i), (r_i, 0), (0, 0)$.

Call H' the hexagon with vertices $(0, 0), (N - r_i, 0), (N, r_i), (N, N - r_i), (N - r_i, N), (0, N)$. Note that since H' is a polyhedron, its diameter is given by the two vertices furthest apart. Therefore $\text{diam}(H') = \sqrt{N^2 + (N - r_i)^2} = \sqrt{N^2 + (\ell_i^2 - N^2)} = \ell_i$. Therefore, v^2 must lie inside the triangles with vertices $(N - r_i, N), (N, N - r_i), (N, N)$ or inside the triangle with vertices $(N - r_i, 0), (N, 0), (N, r_i)$. If v^2 lies in the latter triangle, then $\ell_i \leq \sqrt{N^2 + r_i^2} < \sqrt{N^2 + (N - r_i)^2} = \ell_i$ which is a contradiction. Therefore, $v^2 \in T_1(r_i)$. This implies that $D \subseteq H_1(r_i)$. Assume now additionally that $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_M$. Let v be a vertex of P with $v^1 \neq v \neq v^2$. The distance between v and D is at most $h_i \leq \frac{1}{8}(\sqrt{2}N - \ell_i) \leq 2^{j-3}$. Therefore, v is contained in $H_1(r_i + \sqrt{2}2^{j-3})$ and hence $P \subseteq H_1(r_i + \sqrt{2}2^{j-3})$.

The case that $v^1 \in T_2(r_i)$ can be handled similarly and in this case we conclude that $v^2 \in T_2(r_i)$, $D \subseteq H_2(r_i)$, and $P \subseteq H_2(r_i + \sqrt{2}2^{j-3})$. \blacksquare

We choose $C_j := N - \sqrt{(\sqrt{2}N - 2^j)^2 - N^2} + \sqrt{2}2^{j-3}$ and note that for every placement P of P_i we have that $P \subseteq H_1(r_i + \sqrt{2}2^{j-3}) \subseteq H_1(C_j) = H_{1,j}$ or $P \subseteq H_2(r_i + \sqrt{2}2^{j-3}) \subseteq H_2(C_j) = H_{2,j}$ as $r_i \leq N - \sqrt{(\sqrt{2}N - 2^j)^2 - N^2}$. Furthermore the area of $H_{1,j}$ (and hence the area of $H_{2,j}$) is upper bounded as follows:

Note that we can compute $\text{area}(H(r))$ by computing twice the area of half the hexagon: i.e. the quadrilateral $(0, 0), (N, N), (N - r, N)$ and (r, N) , we now divide this quadrilateral into two isosceles right triangles with hypotenuse r and a rectangle with sides $2\sqrt{N} - 2r/\sqrt{2}$ and $r/\sqrt{2}$, obtaining the following:

$$\frac{1}{2}\text{area}(H(r)) = \frac{r^2}{2} + \frac{r}{\sqrt{2}}(\sqrt{2}N - 2r) = (2N - r)\frac{r}{2}$$

More generally if $r_2 > r_1$ we can compute $\text{area}(H(r_2) \setminus H(r_1))$ by computing twice the area of the quadrilateral $(0, r_1), (r_1, N), (r_2, N), (0, r_2)$, and doing the same splitting into triangles and rectangles we get:

$$\frac{1}{2}\text{area}(H(r_2) \setminus H(r_1)) = \frac{r_2 - r_1}{2}(2N - r_2 - r_1)$$

We can now compute the area of $H_{1,j}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{area}(H_{1,j}) &= \text{area}(H(C_j - \sqrt{2}2^{j-3})) + \text{area}(H(C_j) \setminus H(C_j - \sqrt{2}2^{j-3})) \\
&\leq \left(N + \sqrt{(\sqrt{2}N - 2^j)^2 - N^2} \right) \left(N - \sqrt{(\sqrt{2}N - 2^j)^2 - N^2} \right) + \sqrt{2}2^{j-3} \sqrt{(\sqrt{2}N - 2^j)^2 - N^2} \\
&= (2N^2 - (\sqrt{2}N - 2^j)^2) + \sqrt{2}2^{j-3}(\sqrt{2}N - 2^{j-1}) \\
&= 2^{j+1}(\sqrt{2}N - 2^{j-1}) + \sqrt{2}2^{j-3}(\sqrt{2}N - 2^{j-1}) \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{8\sqrt{2}} \right) 2^4 2^{j-3} (\sqrt{2}N - 2^{j-1}) \\
&= \left(1 + \frac{1}{8\sqrt{2}} \right) 2^4 \text{area}(R_j \cup R'_j) \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Using this, we can partition $\mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_M \cap \text{OPT}$ into at most $O(1)$ subsets such that for each subset \mathcal{P}' it holds that $h(\mathcal{P}') \leq 2^{j-3}$ and hence \mathcal{P}' fits into R_j (and R'_j) using our packing strategy above. Here we use that each medium polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_j$ satisfies that $h_i \leq 2^{j-3}$.

Lemma 17. *For each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ there are disjoint set $\mathcal{P}_{j,1}^*, \mathcal{P}_{j,2}^* \subseteq \mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_M \cap \text{OPT}$ with $w(\mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_M \cap \text{OPT}) \leq O(w(\mathcal{P}_{j,1}^* \cup \mathcal{P}_{j,2}^*))$ such that $h(\mathcal{P}_{j,1}^*) \leq 2^{j-3}$ and $h(\mathcal{P}_{j,2}^*) \leq 2^{j-3}$.*

Proof. We begin by partitioning $\mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_M \cap \text{OPT} = \{P'_1, \dots, P'_m\}$ into groups such that each group fits into $R_j \cup R'_j$. To do so, define a sequence s_j such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
s_0 &= 0, \\
s_\ell &= \max \left\{ k \in \{s_{\ell-1} + 1, \dots, m\} : \sum_{i=s_{\ell-1}+1}^k h(P'_i) \leq 2^{\ell-3} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consider now the partition of $\mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_M \cap \text{OPT}$ into p parts of the form $\mathcal{C}_\ell = \{P'_{s_{\ell-1}+1}, \dots, P'_{s_\ell}\}$. Recall that $\sqrt{2}N - 2^j \leq \ell_i$. Since $h_i \leq \frac{h'_i}{8} \leq \frac{1}{8}2^{j-3}$, for $1 \leq \ell < p$ we have $\sum_{P_i \in \mathcal{C}_j} h_i \geq (1 - \frac{1}{8})2^{j-3}$. Therefore:

$$\sum_{P_i \in \mathcal{C}_j} \text{area}(P_i) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{P_i \in \mathcal{C}_j} \text{area}(B_i) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{P_i \in \mathcal{C}_j} h_i \ell_i \geq \frac{1}{2} (1 - \frac{1}{8}) 2^{j-3} (\sqrt{2}N - 2^j).$$

More so, as the polygons are not in \mathcal{P}_E , we get that $\sqrt{2}N - 2^j > N \geq N(1 - \frac{2^{j-1}}{\sqrt{2}N}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\sqrt{2}N - 2^{j-1})$. Using this:

$$\sum_{P_i \in \mathcal{C}_j} \text{area}(P_i) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{8} \right) 2^{j-3} (\sqrt{2}N - 2^j) \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{8} \right) 2^{j-3} (\sqrt{2}N - 2^{j-1}) = \frac{(1 - \frac{1}{8})}{2\sqrt{2}} \text{area}(R_j \cup R'_j).$$

By Lemma 16 we get that:

$$2^5 (1 + \frac{1}{8\sqrt{2}}) \text{area}(R_j \cup R'_j) \geq \text{area}(\mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_M \cap \text{OPT}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^p \sum_{P_i \in \mathcal{C}_\ell} \text{area}(P_i) \geq p \frac{(1 - \frac{1}{8})}{2\sqrt{2}} \text{area}(R_j \cup R'_j),$$

concluding that $p \leq 7 \cdot 2^6$. Call \mathcal{C}_1^* and \mathcal{C}_2^* the most profitable parts of the partition. Using our bound on p we get:

$$w(\mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_M \cap \text{OPT}) \leq \frac{p}{2} w(\mathcal{C}_1^* \cup \mathcal{C}_2^*) \leq 7 \cdot 2^5 w(\mathcal{C}_1^* \cup \mathcal{C}_2^*). \quad \square$$

By combining Lemmas 14, 15 and 17 we obtain the proof of Lemma 7.

2.3. Hard polygons. We first show that for each class \mathcal{P}_j there are at most a constant number of polygons from $\mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_H$ in OPT, and that for only $O(\log N)$ classes \mathcal{P}_j it holds that $\mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_H \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 18. *For each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ it holds that $|\mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_H \cap \text{OPT}| \leq O(1)$. Also, if $\mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_H \neq \emptyset$ then $j \in \{j_{\min}, \dots, j_{\max}\}$ with $j_{\min} := -\lceil \log N \rceil$ and $j_{\max} := 1 + \lceil \log((\sqrt{2} - 1)N) \rceil$.*

Proof. Recall that $\mathcal{P}_j := \{i \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}_E \mid \ell_i \in [\sqrt{2}N - 2^j, \sqrt{2}N - 2^{j-1}]\}$. Hence, if $j > 1 + \log((\sqrt{2} - 1)N)$ then $\sqrt{2}N - 2^{j-1} < N$ and therefore $\mathcal{P}_j = \emptyset$ since all polygons P_i with $\ell_i \in [\sqrt{2}N - 2^j, \sqrt{2}N - 2^{j-1}]$ satisfy that $\ell_i < N$ and hence $P_i \notin \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}_E$.

Note that ℓ_i^2 must be a positive integer. Then it is sufficient to prove that if $j \leq \frac{3}{2} - \log N$, then $[(\sqrt{2}N - 2^j)^2, (\sqrt{2}N - 2^{j-1})^2] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ is empty. We prove the stronger claim that $[(\sqrt{2}N - 2^j)^2, 2N^2) \cap \mathbb{Z} = \emptyset$. Note that:

$$(\sqrt{2}N)^2 - (\sqrt{2}N - 2^j)^2 = 2^j(2\sqrt{2}N - 2^j) < 2^{j+\frac{3}{2}}N \leq 1$$

From which we conclude.

We now prove the second part of the lemma by breaking the polygons into two sets. Define $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_H \cap \text{OPT}$ as the polygons that fit completely into $H(C_j)$ as in Claim 2.2 and $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ as $(\mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_H \cap \text{OPT}) \setminus \mathcal{F}$. We begin with the polygons in \mathcal{F} . Recall that by Lemma 10 $\text{area}(P_i) \geq \frac{1}{2}\ell_i h_i$ using additionally that $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_H$ we get:

$$\text{area}(P_i) \geq \frac{1}{2}\ell_i h_i > \frac{1}{16}(\sqrt{2}N - 2^j)(\sqrt{2}N - \ell_i) \geq \frac{1}{16}(\sqrt{2}N - 2^j)2^{j-1}.$$

Therefore:

$$\text{area}(\mathcal{F}) \geq \frac{1}{8}|\mathcal{F}|(\sqrt{2}N - 2^j)2^{j-2}$$

Additionally, by Lemma 16 we have that $\text{area}(\mathcal{F}) \leq 2^{j+1}(\sqrt{2}N - 2^{j-1})$. Combining these two, and recalling that by the first part of the Lemma we may assume that $j \leq \log((\sqrt{2} - 1)N)$ we get:

$$|\mathcal{F}| \leq 2^6 \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}N - 2^{j-1}}{\sqrt{2}N - 2^j} \right) \leq 2^6 \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}N}{\sqrt{2}N - 2^j} \right) \leq 2^6 \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}N}{\sqrt{2}N - (\sqrt{2} - 1)N} \right) \leq 2^{6+\frac{1}{2}}$$

We now deal with $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ note that $K \setminus H(C_j)$ has two connected components, we show that in each one there is at most one polygon intersecting it. These two are exactly the triangle T_1 with vertices $(0, N)$, $(N - C, N)$, $(0, C)$ and T_2 with vertices $(N, 0)$, $(N, N - C)$ and $(C, 0)$.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exist points $p_1, p_2 \in T_1$ belonging to some polygons P_1 and P_2 . Let $D^1 = u^1 v^1$ and $D^2 = u^2 v^2$ be the diagonals of P_1 and P_2 respectively. Let r_1 and r_2 be as in Claim 2.2 and define $s = \max(r_1, r_2)$. By the same Claim we get $\{u^1, v^1, u^2, v^2\} \subseteq T(s)$. We now consider the rays for $i \in [2]$, $R_i \doteq \{p_i + \lambda \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} : \lambda \geq 0\}$. Note that since $s \leq C_j$, then R_1 and R_2 don't intersect $T(s)$, but by convexity of P_1 and P_2 they must intersect D^1 and D^2 . Note that R_1 intersects first D^1 and then D^2 (otherwise P_1 and P_2 would be intersecting) and R_2 intersects first D^2 and then D^1 . Therefore R_1 and R_2 intersect D^1 and D^2 in different order, which means that D^1 and D^2 must intersect, a contradiction. \square

We describe now a quasi-polynomial time algorithm for hard polygons, i.e., we want to prove Lemma 8. Lemma 18 implies that $|\mathcal{P}_H \cap \text{OPT}| \leq O(\log N)$. Therefore, we can enumerate all possibilities for $\mathcal{P}_H \cap \text{OPT}$ in time $n^{O(\log N)}$. For each for each enumerated set $\mathcal{P}'_H \subseteq \mathcal{P}_H$ we need to check whether it fits into K . We cannot try all possibilities for placing \mathcal{P}'_H into K since we are allowed to rotate the polygons in \mathcal{P}'_H by arbitrary angles. To this end, we show that there is a subset of $\mathcal{P}_H \cap \text{OPT}$ of large weight which contains only a single polygon or it does not use the complete space of the knapsack but leaves some empty space. We use this empty space

to move the polygons slightly and rotate them such that each of them is placed in one out of $(nN)^{O(1)}$ different positions that we can compute beforehand. Hence, we can guess all positions of these polygons in time $(nN)^{O(\log N)}$. We define that a *placement* of a polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ inside K is a polygon \tilde{P}_i such that $d + \text{rot}_\alpha(P_i) = \tilde{P}_i \subseteq K$ where $d \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\text{rot}_\alpha(P_i)$ is the polygon that we obtain when we rotate P_i by an angle α clockwise around its first vertex.

Lemma 19. *For each polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_H$ we can compute a set of $(nN)^{O(1)}$ possible placements \mathcal{L}_i in time $(nN)^{O(1)}$ such that there exists a set $\mathcal{P}'_H \subseteq \mathcal{P}_H \cap \text{OPT}$ with $w(\mathcal{P}_H \cap \text{OPT}) \leq O(w(\mathcal{P}'_H))$ which can be packed into K such that each polygon P_i is packed according to a placement in \mathcal{L}_i .*

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ to be defined later. First, we observe that there can be only $O_\epsilon(1)$ classes \mathcal{P}_j containing polygons whose respective values ℓ_i are not larger than $(\sqrt{2} - \epsilon)N$; recall that $\sqrt{2}N$ is the length of the diagonal of K .

Proposition 20. *For each $\epsilon > 0$ there is a constant $k_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that each polygon $P_i \in \bigcup_{j=j_{\min}}^{j_{\max}-k_\epsilon} \mathcal{P}_j$ satisfies that $\ell_i \geq (\sqrt{2} - \epsilon)N$.*

Due to Lemma 18 there can be only $O_\epsilon(1)$ hard polygons in $\text{OPT} \cap \bigcup_{j=j_{\max}-k_\epsilon+1}^{j_{\max}} \mathcal{P}_j$. Hence, it suffices to prove the claim for the hard polygons in $\text{OPT}' := \text{OPT} \cap \bigcup_{j=j_{\min}}^{j_{\max}-k_\epsilon} \mathcal{P}_j$. Since for each polygon $P_i \in \text{OPT}'$ it holds that $\ell_i \geq (\sqrt{2} - \epsilon)N$ we have that in any placement of P_i inside K the line segment defining ℓ_i (i.e., the line segment connecting the two vertices of P_i with maximum distance) has to have essentially a 45° angle with the edges of the knapsack.

Let L denote the line segment connecting $p_L := (\frac{0}{N/2})$, and $p_R := (\frac{N}{N/2})$. Let L_1 denote the line segment connecting $p_M := (\frac{N/2}{N/2})$ and p_R , and let L_2 denote the line segment connecting p_L and p_M (see Figure 3). By losing a factor 3 we can assume that each polygon in OPT' intersects L_1 but not L_2 . We group the polygons in OPT' into three groups $\text{OPT}^{(1)}, \text{OPT}^{(2)}, \text{OPT}^{(3)}$. We define that $\text{OPT}^{(1)}$ contains the polygons in OPT' that have empty intersection with $[0, \frac{1}{nN}] \times [0, N]$. We define that $\text{OPT}^{(2)}$ contains the polygons in $\text{OPT}' \setminus \text{OPT}^{(1)}$ that have empty intersection with $[0, N] \times [0, \frac{1}{nN}]$. Finally, we define $\text{OPT}^{(3)} := \text{OPT}' \setminus (\text{OPT}^{(1)} \cup \text{OPT}^{(2)})$.

Consider the group $\text{OPT}^{(1)}$. If ϵ is sufficiently small then every polygon in OPT' intersects L . We sort the polygons in OPT' in the order in which they intersect L from left to right, let $\text{OPT}' = \{Q_1, \dots, Q_k\}$ denote this ordering. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ we now translate each polygon Q_i to the left by $\frac{n-i+1}{n^2N}$ units. We argue that between any two consecutive polygons Q_i, Q_{i+1} there is some empty space that intuitively we can use as slack. Since Q_i, Q_{i+1} are convex, for their original placement there is a line L' that separates them. If ϵ is sufficiently small, then the line segments defining ℓ_i and ℓ'_{i+1} have essentially a 45° angle with the edges of the knapsack. Since $\ell_i \geq (\sqrt{2} - \epsilon)N$ and $\ell'_{i+1} \geq (\sqrt{2} - \epsilon)N$ this implies that also L' also essentially forms a 45° angle with the edges of the knapsack. After translating Q_i and Q_{i+1} we can draw not only line separating them (like L') but instead a strip separating them, defined via two lines L'', L''' whose angle is identical to the angle of L' , and such that the distance between L'' and L''' is at least $\Omega(\frac{1}{nN})$. Next, we rotate Q_i around one of its vertices until the angle of the line segment defining ℓ_i is a multiple of $\eta \frac{1}{nN^2}$ for some small constant $\eta > 0$ to be defined later, or one of the vertices of Q_i touches an edge of the knapsack. In the latter case, let v be a vertex of Q_i that now touches an edge of the knapsack. We rotate Q_i around v until the angle of the line segment defining ℓ_i is a multiple of $\eta \frac{1}{nN^2}$ or another vertex v' of Q_i touches an edge of the knapsack. In the latter case we observe that two vertices of Q_i touch an edge of the knapsack. Since Q_i has at most $O(N)$ vertices, there are at most $O(N^2)$ such orientations for Q_i . Otherwise, there are only nN^2/η possibilities for the angle of the line segment defining ℓ_i

which gives at most $O(nN^2/\eta)$ possible orientations for Q_i in total. Finally, we move Q_i to the closest placement with the property that the first vertex v of Q_i is placed on a position in which both coordinates are multiples of $\eta \frac{1}{nN}$. One can show that due to the empty space between any two consecutive polygons Q_i, Q_{i+1} no two polygons overlap after the movement, if η is chosen sufficiently small. This yields a placement for the polygons in $\text{OPT}^{(1)}$ in which each polygon Q_i is placed according to one out of $(nN)^{O(1)}$ positions.

We use a symmetric argumentation for the polygons in $\text{OPT}^{(2)}$. Finally, we want to argue that $|\text{OPT}^{(3)}| = O(1)$. Observe that each polygon $P_i \in \text{OPT}^{(3)}$ intersects L_1 , the stripe $[0, \frac{1}{nN}] \times [0, N]$, the stripe $[0, N] \times [0, \frac{1}{nN}]$, but has empty intersection with L_2 . Hence, the line segment defining ℓ_i must have length at least $\sqrt{2}N - \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{nN}$. Therefore, $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_{-\infty}$ or $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_j$ with $2^j \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{nN}$ and then $j \leq \log(2\sqrt{2}) - \log(nN)$. First assume that $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_j$. If n is a sufficiently large constant we have that $j < j_{\min}$ which contradicts Lemma 18. On the other hand, if $n = O(1)$ then the claim is trivially true since then $|\text{OPT}| = O(1)$. Otherwise, assume that $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_{-\infty}$. By Lemma 18 there can be at most $O(1)$ polygons from $\mathcal{P}_{-\infty}$ in OPT . \square

This yields the proof of Lemma 8.

2.4. Hard triangles. In this section we present a $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm in *polynomial* time for hard polygons assuming that they are all triangles, i.e., we prove Lemma 9. Slightly abusing notation, denote by OPT the set \mathcal{P}'_H obtained by applying Lemma 19. We distinguish the triangles in OPT into two types: *edge-facing* triangles and *corner-facing* triangles. Let $P_i \in \text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{P}_H$, let e_1, e_2 denote the two longest edges of P_i , and let v_i^* the vertex of P_i adjacent to e_1 and e_2 . Let $R_i^{(1)}$ and $R_i^{(2)}$ be the two rays that originate at v_i^* and that contain e_1 and e_2 , respectively, in the placement of P_i in OPT . We have that $R_i^{(1)} \setminus \{v_i^*\}$ and $R_i^{(2)} \setminus \{v_i^*\}$ intersect at most one edge of the knapsack each. If $R_i^{(1)} \setminus \{v_i^*\}$ and $R_i^{(2)} \setminus \{v_i^*\}$ intersect the same edge of the knapsack then we say that P_i is *edge-facing*, if one of them intersects a horizontal edge and the other one intersects a vertical edge we say that P_i is *corner-facing*. The next lemma shows that there can be only $O(1)$ triangles in $\text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{P}_H$ that are neither edge- nor corner-facing, and therefore we compute a $O(1)$ -approximation with respect to the total profit of such triangles by simply selecting the input triangle with maximum weight.

Lemma 21. *There can be at most $O(1)$ triangles in $\text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{P}_H$ that are neither edge-facing nor corner-facing.*

Proof. Let $P_i \in \text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{P}_H$ that is neither edge-facing nor corner-facing. Assume w.l.o.g. that both $R_i^{(1)} \setminus \{v_i^*\}$ and $R_i^{(2)} \setminus \{v_i^*\}$ intersect a horizontal edge of the knapsack. Let e_1, e_2 denote the two longest edges of P_i . Since P_i is hard, we know that one of these edges is longer than N and therefore the other one is longer than $N/2$. Let α denote the angle between e_1 and e_2 . It holds that α cannot be arbitrarily small since otherwise it cannot be that $R_i^{(1)} \setminus \{v_i^*\}$ and $R_i^{(2)} \setminus \{v_i^*\}$ intersect different horizontal edges of the knapsack. Formally, assume w.l.o.g. that v_i^* lies in the upper half of the knapsack and that $R_i^{(1)} \setminus \{v_i^*\}$ intersects the bottom edge of the knapsack. Let β denote the angle between the horizontal line going through v_i^* and $R_i^{(1)}$ (note that $\alpha \geq \beta$). Then one can show that $\tan \beta \geq 1/2$ and thus $\alpha \geq \beta \geq \pi/8$. Therefore, $\text{area}(P_i) \geq \Omega(N^2)$. Hence, there can be at most $O(1)$ triangles in $P_i \in \text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{P}_H$ that are neither edge-facing nor corner-facing. \square

Let p_{TL} , p_{TR} , p_{BL} , and p_{BR} denote the top left, top right, bottom left, and bottom right corners of K , respectively, and let $p_M := (\frac{N/2}{N/2})$, $p_L := (\frac{0}{N/2})$, and $p_R := (\frac{N}{N/2})$, see Figure 3. By

losing a factor $O(1)$ we assume from now on that that OPT contains at most one hard triangle from each group \mathcal{P}_j , using Lemma 18.

Let $\text{OPT}_{\text{EF}} \subseteq \text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{P}_H$ denote the edge-facing hard triangles in OPT and denote by $\text{OPT}_{\text{CF}} \subseteq \text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{P}_H$ the corner-facing hard triangles in OPT . In the remainder of this section we present now $O(1)$ -approximation algorithms for edge-facing and for corner-facing triangles in \mathcal{P}_H . By selecting the best solution among the two we obtain the proof of Lemma 9.

2.4.1. Edge-facing triangles. We define a special type of solutions called *top-left-packings* that our algorithm will compute. We will show later that there are solutions of this type whose profit is at least a constant fraction of the profit of OPT_{EF} .

For each $t \in \mathbb{N}$ let $p_t := p_M + \frac{t}{N^2} \binom{1}{0}$. Let $\mathcal{P}' = \{P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_k}\}$ be a set of triangles that are ordered according to the groups \mathcal{P}_j , i.e., such that for any $P_{i_\ell}, P_{i_{\ell+1}} \in \mathcal{P}'$ with $P_{i_\ell} \in \mathcal{P}_j$ and $P_{i_{\ell+1}} \in \mathcal{P}_{j'}$ for some j, j' it holds that $j \leq j'$. We define a placement of \mathcal{P}' that we call a *top-left-packing*. First, we place P_{i_1} such that $v_{i_1}^*$ coincides with p_{TL} and one edge of P_{i_1} lies on the diagonal of K that connects p_{TL} and p_0 . Note that there is a unique way to place P_{i_1} in this way. Iteratively, suppose that we have packed triangles $\{P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_\ell}\}$ such that for each triangle $P_{i_{\ell'}}$ in this set its respective vertex $v_{i_{\ell'}}^*$ coincides with p_{TL} , see Figure 1c). Intuitively, we pack $P_{i_{\ell+1}}$ on top of P_{i_ℓ} such that $v_{i_{\ell+1}}^*$ coincides with p_{TL} . Let t be the smallest integer such that the line segment connecting p_t and p_R has empty intersection with each triangle $P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_\ell}$ according to our placement. We place $P_{i_{\ell+1}}$ such that $v_{i_{\ell+1}}^*$ coincides with p_{TL} and one of its edges lies on the line that contains p_{TL} and p_t . There is a unique way to place $P_{i_{\ell+1}}$ in this way. We continue until we placed all triangles in \mathcal{P}' . If all of them are placed completely inside K we say that the resulting solution is a *top-left-packing* and that \mathcal{P}' is *top-left-packable*. We define *bottom-right-packing* and *bottom-right-packable* symmetrically, mirroring the above definition along the line that contains p_{BL} and p_{TR} .

In the next lemma, we show that there is always a top-left-packable or a bottom-right-packable solution with large profit compared to $\mathcal{P}_H \cap \text{OPT}$ or there is a single triangle with large profit.

Lemma 22. *There exists a solution $\mathcal{P}_H^* \subseteq \mathcal{P}_H \cap \text{OPT}_{\text{EF}}$ such that $w(\mathcal{P}_H \cap \text{OPT}_{\text{EF}}) \leq O(w(\mathcal{P}_H^*))$ and*

- \mathcal{P}_H^* is top-left-packable or bottom-right-packable and for each j we have that $|\mathcal{P}_H^* \cap \mathcal{P}_j| \leq 1$,
- or it holds that $|\mathcal{P}_H^*| = 1$.

A complete proof of this Lemma is the main topic of the next subsection.

We describe now a polynomial time algorithm that computes the most profitable solution that satisfies the properties of Lemma 22. To find the most profitable solution \mathcal{P}_H^* that satisfies that $|\mathcal{P}_H^*| = 1$ we simply take the triangle with maximum weight, let P_{i^*} be this triangle. We establish now a dynamic program that computes the most profitable top-left-packable solution; computing the most profitable bottom-right-packable solution works analogously. Our DP has a cell corresponding to pairs (j, t) with $j, t \in \mathbb{Z}$. Intuitively, (j, t) represents the subproblem of computing a set $\mathcal{P}'_H \subseteq \mathcal{P}_H$ of maximum weight such that $\mathcal{P}'_H \cap \mathcal{P}_{j'} = \emptyset$ for each $j' < j$ and $|\mathcal{P}'_H \cap \mathcal{P}_{j''}| \leq 1$ for each $j'' \geq j$ and such that \mathcal{P}'_H is top-left-packable inside the triangular area T_t defined by the line that contains p_{TL} and p_t , the top edge of K , and the right edge of K . Given a cell (j, t) we want to compute a solution $DP(j, t)$ associated with (j, t) . Intuitively, we guess whether the optimal solution \mathcal{P}'_H to (j, t) contains a triangle from $\mathcal{P}_H \cap \mathcal{P}_j$. Therefore, we try each triangle $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_H \cap \mathcal{P}_j$ and place it inside T_t such that v_i^* coincides with p_{TL} and one of its edges lies on the line containing p_{TL} and p_t . Let $t'(P_i)$ denote the smallest integer such that $t'(P_i) \geq t$ and $p_{t'}(P_i)$ is not contained in the resulting placement of P_i inside T_t . We associate

with P_i the solution $P_i \cup DP(j+1, t'(P_i))$. Finally, we define $DP(j, t)$ to be the solution of maximum profit among the solutions $P_i \cup DP(j+1, t'(P_i))$ for each $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_H \cap \mathcal{P}_j$ and the solution $DP(j+1, t)$.

We introduce a DP-cell $DP(j, t)$ for each pair $(j, t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ where $j_{\min} \leq j \leq j_{\max}$ and $0 \leq t \leq \log_{1+1/n} \left(\frac{N}{2} \right)$. Note that due to Lemma 18 for all other values of j we have that $\mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_H = \emptyset$. Also note that $p_t \notin K$ if $t \geq N^2/2$. This yields at most $(nN)^{O(1)}$ cells in total. Finally, we output the solution $DP(j_{\min}, 0)$.

In the next lemma we prove that our DP computes the optimal top-left-packable solution with the properties of Lemma 22.

Lemma 23. *There is an algorithm with a running time of $(nN)^{O(1)}$ that computes the optimal solution $\mathcal{P}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}_H$ such that \mathcal{P}' is top-left-packable or bottom-right-packable and such that for each j we have that $|\mathcal{P}' \cap \mathcal{P}_j| \leq 1$.*

Proof. We say that a set of triangles S is a (j, t) -solution if it is top-left-packable inside of T_t , only uses items from $\bigcup_{j'' \geq j} \mathcal{P}_H \cap \mathcal{P}_{j''}$ and $|\mathcal{P}_H \cap \mathcal{P}_{j''}| \leq 1$ for each $j'' \geq j$. Let $\text{OPT}_{j,t}$ be the (j, t) -solution of maximum weight. We aim to show that $\text{OPT}_{j,t} = DP(j, t)$ for each $j_{\min} \leq j \leq j_{\max}$ and $0 \leq t \leq \log_{1+\frac{1}{n}} \left(\frac{N}{2} \right)$.

We proceed by backwards induction on j . If $j = j_{\max}$ then $\text{OPT}_{j,t}$ is exactly the packing of the top-left-packable triangle of maximum weight in T_t . Since $DP(j, t)$ tries to top-left-pack all triangles into T_t it is clear that $\text{OPT}_{j,t} = DP(j, t)$. We now deal with the case $j < j_{\max}$. By induction $DP(j, t)$ is the solution of maximum profit among $P_i \cup \text{OPT}(j+1, t'(P_i))$ for $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_H \cap \mathcal{P}_j$ and $\text{OPT}(j+1, t)$. Suppose, by contradiction, that there exists a (j, t) -solution S such that $w(S) > w(DP(j, t))$. We now consider two cases. If $|S \cap \mathcal{P}_j| \neq \emptyset$, we select $P_{i^*} \in S \cap \mathcal{P}_j$ and note that:

$$w(P_{i^*}) + w(\text{OPT}(j+1, t'(P_{i^*}))) \leq w(DP(j, t)) < w(P_{i^*}) + w(S \setminus \{P_{i^*}\}).$$

Therefore $w(S \setminus \{P_{i^*}\}) > w(\text{OPT}(j+1, t'(P_{i^*})))$ which contradicts the optimality of $w(\text{OPT}(j+1, t'(P_{i^*})))$, since they are both $(j+1, t'(P_{i^*}))$ -solutions. We now consider the case $|S \cap \mathcal{P}_j| = \emptyset$. In this case we have:

$$\text{OPT}(j+1, t) \leq w(DP(j, t)) < w(S).$$

Hence $w(S) > w(\text{OPT}(j+1, t))$ which contradicts the optimality of $\text{OPT}(j+1, t)$, as they are both $(j+1, t)$ -solutions.

We conclude that $\text{OPT}_{j,t} = DP(j, t)$ for each $j_{\min} \leq j \leq j_{\max}$ and $0 \leq t \leq \log_{1+\frac{1}{n}} \left(\frac{N}{2} \right)$. In particular $DP(j_{\min}, 0) = \text{OPT}_{j,0}$, as desired. Note that the bottom-right-packable case can be dealt in a similar manner, concluding the proof. \square

We execute the above DP and its counterpart for bottom-right-packable solutions to obtain a top-left-packable solution \mathcal{P}'_1 and a bottom-right-packable solution \mathcal{P}'_2 . We output the most profitable solution among $\{P_{i^*}\}, \mathcal{P}'_1, \mathcal{P}'_2$. Due to Lemma 22 this yields a solution with weight at least $\Omega(w(\mathcal{P}_H \cap \text{OPT}))$.

Lemma 24. *There is an algorithm with a running time of $(nN)^{O(1)}$ that computes a solution $\mathcal{P}'_H \subseteq \mathcal{P}_H$ such that $w(\text{OPT}_{\text{EF}}) \leq O(w(\mathcal{P}'_H))$.*

2.4.2. Corner-facing triangles. We present now a $O(1)$ -approximation algorithm for the corner-facing triangles in OPT, i.e., our algorithm computes a solution $\mathcal{P}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ of profit at least $\Omega(w(\text{OPT}_{\text{CF}}))$. We first establish some properties for OPT_{CF} . We argue that by losing a constant factor we can assume that each triangle in OPT_{CF} intuitively faces the bottom-right corner.




FIGURE 3. Left: The points $p_{TL}, p_{TR}, p_{BL}, p_{BR}, p_L, p_M, p_R$. Right: A corner-facing triangle, its vertices v_i^* and \bar{v}_i , and the lines L_i and R_i^{up} .

Lemma 25. *By losing a factor 4 we can assume that for each triangle $P_i \in \text{OPT}_{CF}$ we have that $R_i^{(1)} \setminus \{v_i^*\}$ intersects the bottom edge of the knapsack and $R_i^{(2)} \setminus \{v_i^*\}$ intersects the right edge of the knapsack, or vice versa.*

Proof. We can partition OPT_{CF} into four groups according to which corner the triangles in this group face. By losing a factor of 4 we keep only the group with largest weight. Then we rotate the solution appropriately such that the claim of the lemma holds. \square

In the following lemma we establish a property that will be crucial for our algorithm. For each $P_i \in \text{OPT}_{CF}$ let R_i^{up} denote the ray originating at v_i^* and going upwards. We establish that we can assume that R_i^{up} does not intersect with any triangle $P_{i'} \in \text{OPT}_{CF}$, see Figure 3.

Lemma 26. *By losing a factor $O(1)$ we can assume that for each $P_i, P_{i'} \in \text{OPT}_{CF}$ it holds that $R_i^{up} \cap P_{i'} = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be a constant to be defined later. By losing a factor $O_\epsilon(1)$ we can assume for each triangle in OPT_{CF} that its longest edge has length at least $(1 - \epsilon)\sqrt{2}N$. This holds since all other triangles are contained in only $O_\epsilon(1)$ groups \mathcal{P}_j with only $O_\epsilon(1)$ triangles in OPT_{CF} in total (see Lemma 18). Note that this implies then for each triangle $P_i \in \text{OPT}_{CF}$ in any placement inside of the knapsack that the vertex v_i^* lies close to p_{TL} , i.e., at distance of at most $O(\epsilon)N$.

Assume by contradiction that there is a triangle $P_{i'} \in \text{OPT}_{CF}$ with $R_i^{up} \cap P_{i'} \neq \emptyset$. Then $v_{i'}^*$ must lie on the left of the vertical line ℓ that contains R_i^{up} . If both other vertices of $P_{i'}$ lie on the right of ℓ then this contradicts that $P_{i'}$ faces the bottom right corner. Otherwise, we can choose ϵ sufficiently small such that v_i^* is contained in the placement of $P_{i'}$ inside the knapsack since both v_i^* and $v_{i'}^*$ are close to p_{TL} and $v_{i'}^*$ is incident to one edge with length at least N and to one edge with length at least $N/2$. This is a contradiction \square

Our algorithm is a dynamic program that intuitively guesses the placements of the triangles in OPT_{CF} step by step. To this end, each DP-cell corresponds to a subproblem that is defined via a part $K' \subseteq K$ of the knapsack and a subset of the groups $J \subseteq \{j_{\min}, \dots, j_{\max}\}$. The goal is to place triangles from $\bigcup_{j \in J} \mathcal{P}_j$ of maximum profit into K' . Formally, each DP-cell is defined by up to two triangles $P_i, P_{i'}$, placements $\bar{P}_i, \bar{P}_{i'}$ for them, and a set $J \subseteq \{j_{\min}, \dots, j_{\max}\}$; if the cell is defined via exactly one triangle P_i then there is also a value $\text{dir} \in \{\text{left}, \text{mid}\}$. The corresponding region K' is defined as follows: if the cell is defined via zero triangles then the region is the whole knapsack K . Otherwise, let \bar{v}_i denote the right-most vertex of \bar{P}_i , i.e., the vertex of \bar{P}_i that is closest to the right edge of the knapsack (see Figure 3). Let L_i denote the vertical line




FIGURE 4. The cases in the transition of the DP for corner-facing triangles (see Lemma 27).

that goes through \bar{v}_i (and thus intersects the top and the bottom edge of the knapsack). If the cell is defined via one triangle P_i then observe that $K \setminus (\tilde{P}_i \cup R_i^{\text{up}} \cup L_i)$ has three connected components,

- one on the left, surrounded by R_i^{up} , parts of \tilde{P}_i , the left edge of the knapsack, and parts of the top and bottom edge of the knapsack
- one on the right, surrounded by L_i , the right edge of the knapsack, and parts of the top and bottom edge of the knapsack, and
- one in the middle, surrounded by the top edge of the knapsack, \tilde{P}_i , and L_i .

If $\text{dir} = \text{left}$ then the region of the cell equals the left component, if $\text{dir} = \text{mid}$ then the region of the cell equals the middle component. Assume now that the cell is defined via two triangles $P_i, P_{i'}$. Assume w.l.o.g. that \bar{v}_i is closer to the right edge of the knapsack than $\bar{v}_{i'}$. Then $K \setminus (\tilde{P}_i \cup \tilde{P}_{i'} \cup R_i^{\text{up}} \cup R_{i'}^{\text{up}} \cup L_{i'})$ has one connected component that is surrounded by $\tilde{P}_i, \tilde{P}_{i'}, R_i^{\text{up}}, R_{i'}^{\text{up}}, L_{i'}$ and we define the region of the cell to be this component. Observe that the total number of DP-cells is bounded by $(nN)^{O(1)}$, using that there are only $(nN)^{O(1)}$ possible placements for each triangle.

We describe now a dynamic program that computes the optimal solution to each cell. Assume that we are given a cell C for which we want to compute the optimal solution. We guess the triangle P_{i^*} in the optimal solution to this cell such that \bar{v}_{i^*} is closest to the right edge of the knapsack, and its placement \tilde{P}_{i^*} in the optimal solution to C . Let j^* such that $P_{i^*} \in \mathcal{P}_{j^*}$. We will prove in the next lemma that the optimal solution to C consists of P_{i^*} and the optimal solutions to two other DP-cells, see Figure 4.

Lemma 27. *Let C be a DP-cell, let $J \subseteq \{j_{\min}, \dots, j_{\max}\}$, and let $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_\ell, P_{i'} \in \mathcal{P}_{\ell'}$ be two triangles with $\ell < \ell'$ and let $\tilde{P}_i, \tilde{P}_{i'}$ be placements for them. Then there are disjoint sets $J', J'' \subseteq J$ such that*

- (1) *if $C = (J)$, then its optimal solution consists of P_{i^*} and the optimal solutions to the cells $(J', P_{i^*}, \tilde{P}_{i^*}, \text{left})$ and $(J'', P_{i^*}, \tilde{P}_{i^*}, \text{mid})$,*
- (2) *if $C = (J, P_i, \tilde{P}_i, \text{left})$ then its optimal solution consists of P_{i^*} and the optimal solutions to the cells $(J', P_{i^*}, \tilde{P}_{i^*}, \text{left})$ and $(J'', P_i, \tilde{P}_i, P_{i^*}, \tilde{P}_{i^*})$,*
- (3) *if $C = (J, P_i, \tilde{P}_i, \text{mid})$ then its optimal solution consists of P_{i^*} and the optimal solutions to the cells $(J', P_{i^*}, \tilde{P}_{i^*}, \text{mid})$ and $(J'', P_i, \tilde{P}_i, P_{i^*}, \tilde{P}_{i^*})$,*
- (4) *if $C = (J, P_i, \tilde{P}_i, P_{i'}, \tilde{P}_{i'})$ then the optimal solution to C consists of P_{i^*} and the optimal solutions to the cells $(J', P_i, \tilde{P}_i, P_{i^*}, \tilde{P}_{i^*})$ and $(J'', P_{i^*}, \tilde{P}_{i^*}, P_{i'}, \tilde{P}_{i'})$.*

Proof. Let OPT_C denote the optimal solution to the cell C .

Claim. Consider a feasible solution S for the cell C . Let P_{i^*} be the triangle in S whose vertex \bar{v}_{i^*} is closest to the right edge of the knapsack. Then it holds that $L_{i^*} \cap P_i = \emptyset$ for each triangle $P_i \in S$.

Proof of Claim. If this was not the case then there would be a triangle $P_i \in S$ that intersects L_{i^*} . Hence, P_i has one vertex that is closer to the right edge of the knapsack than \bar{v}_{i^*} . In particular, \bar{v}_i is closer to the right edge of the knapsack than \bar{v}_{i^*} which yields a contradiction. ■

First assume that $C = (J)$. By Lemmas 26 and the Claim no triangle in OPT_C intersects L_{i^*} or $R_{i^*}^{\text{up}}$ and no triangle in OPT_C has a vertex on the right of L_{i^*} . Hence, each triangle in OPT_C is contained in the area corresponding to the cells $(J', P_{i^*}, \tilde{P}_{i^*}, \text{left})$ and $(J'', P_{i^*}, \tilde{P}_{i^*}, \text{mid})$. We define J' to be the set of indices $j \in J$ such that in OPT_C there is a triangle $P_i \in \text{OPT}_C$ contained in the area corresponding to $(J', P_{i^*}, \tilde{P}_{i^*}, \text{left})$ and J'' similarly. The other cases can be verified similarly. □

We guess the sets $J', J'' \subseteq J$ according to Lemma 27 and store in C the solution consisting of P_{i^*} , and the solutions stored in the two cells according to the lemma. At the end, the cell $C = (\{j_{\min}, \dots, j_{\max}\})$ (whose corresponding region equals to K) contains the optimal solution.

Lemma 28. *There is an algorithm with a running time of $(nN)^{O(1)}$ that computes a solution $\mathcal{P}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ such that $w(\text{OPT}_{\text{CF}}) \leq O(w(\mathcal{P}'))$.*

Proof. Since we applied Lemma 41 there are only $(nN)^{O(1)}$ different placements for each triangle. Also, there are only $2^{O(\log N)} = N^{O(1)}$ possibilities for the set J in the description of the DP-cell. Therefore, the number of DP-cells is bounded by $(nN)^{O(1)}$. In order to compute the value of a DP-cell C , we guess the triangle P_{i^*} and its corresponding placement \tilde{P}_{i^*} , and in particular we reject a guess if \tilde{P}_{i^*} is not contained in the region corresponding to C . Also, we guess J' and J'' for which there are only $N^{O(1)}$ possibilities each and reject guesses which do not satisfy that $J' \subseteq J$, $J'' \subseteq J$, and that $J' \cap J'' = \emptyset$. Therefore, in each DP-cell we store a solution that is feasible. We can fill the complete DP-table in time $(nN)^{O(1)}$. Using Lemma 27 one can show that the cell $C = (\{j_{\min}, \dots, j_{\max}\})$ contains a solution \mathcal{P}' such that with weight at least $\Omega(w(\text{OPT}_{\text{CF}}))$. □

By combining Lemmas 24 and 28 we obtain the proof of Lemma 9.

2.4.3. Existence of profitable top-left- or bottom-right-packable solution. In this subsection we prove Lemma 22. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be a constant to be defined later. Like in the proof of Lemma 19, we observe that there can be only $O_\epsilon(1)$ classes \mathcal{P}_j containing polygons whose respective values ℓ_i are not larger than $(\sqrt{2} - \epsilon)N$; recall that $\sqrt{2}N$ is the length of the diagonal of K . Furthermore, we have that in any placement of P_i inside K the angle α_i between the line segment defining ℓ_i (i.e., the line segment connecting the two vertices of P_i with maximum distance) and the bottom edge of the knapsack is essentially $\frac{\pi}{4}$. This implies that $\sin \alpha_i$ and $\cos \alpha_i$ are essentially $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$. Finally, recall that $r_i = N - \sqrt{\ell_i^2 - N^2}$ as defined in Lemma 16 this is at most ϵN . We summarize this in the next proposition.

Proposition 29. *For each $\epsilon > 0$ there is a constant $k_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that each polygon $P_i \in \bigcup_{j=j_{\min}}^{j_{\max}-k_\epsilon} \mathcal{P}_j$ satisfies that:*

- (1) $\ell_i \geq (\sqrt{2} - \epsilon)N$,
- (2) $\frac{\pi}{4} - \epsilon \leq \alpha_i \leq \frac{\pi}{4} + \epsilon$,
- (3) $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} - \epsilon \leq \sin \alpha_i \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} + \epsilon$,
- (4) $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} - \epsilon \leq \cos \alpha_i \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} + \epsilon$,

(5) $r_i \leq \epsilon N$.

Proof. We only prove 1 and 5 as 2, 3 and 4 are direct consequence of 1. Note that by choosing $k_\epsilon = j_{\max} - \log(\epsilon N)$ we get that:

$$\ell_i \geq \sqrt{2}N - 2^{j_{\max} - k_\epsilon} = (\sqrt{2} - \epsilon)N.$$

We now prove that $r_i \leq \epsilon N$. Let $\epsilon' = \frac{\epsilon^2}{2\sqrt{2}}$. By part one of this proposition we assume that $\ell_i \geq (2 - \epsilon')N$. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} r_i &\leq \left(1 - \sqrt{(\sqrt{2} - \epsilon')^2 - 1}\right) N \\ &\leq (1 - \sqrt{1 - 2\sqrt{2}\epsilon'})N \\ &\leq \sqrt{2\sqrt{2}\epsilon'}N = \epsilon N. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Due to Lemma 18 there can be only $O_\epsilon(1)$ hard polygons in $\text{OPT} \cap \bigcup_{j=j_{\max}-k_\epsilon+1}^{j_{\max}} \mathcal{P}_j$. Hence, it suffices to prove the claim for the hard polygons in $\text{OPT}_W := \text{OPT}_{\text{EF}} \cap \bigcup_{j=j_{\min}}^{j_{\max}-k_\epsilon} \mathcal{P}_j$ since otherwise the second case of Lemma 22 applies if we define that \mathcal{P}_H^* contains the polygon in OPT_{EF} of maximum weight. Note that it holds that each triangle $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W$ intersects the line segment L that we define to be the line segment that connects p_L with p_R . Let L_1 denote the subsegment of L that connects p_M with p_R and let L_2 denote the line segment connecting p_L with p_M . Now each triangle in OPT_W either overlaps p_M or intersects L_1 but not L_2 or it intersects L_2 but not L_1 . Therefore, by losing a factor of 3 we can restrict ourselves to one of these cases.

Lemma 30. *If ϵ is sufficiently small then by losing a factor 3 we can assume that for each triangle $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W$ we have that $P_i \cap L = P_i \cap L_1$ or that $|\text{OPT}_W| = 1$.*

Proof. There can be at most one triangle $P_{i^*} \in \text{OPT}_W$ that overlaps p_M . Each other triangle $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W$ satisfies that $P_i \cap L = P_i \cap L_1$ or that $P_i \cap L = P_i \cap L_2$. If the triangles $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W$ satisfying $P_i \cap L = P_i \cap L_1$ have a total weight of at least $\frac{1}{3}w(\text{OPT}_W)$ or if $w_{i^*} \geq \frac{1}{3}w(\text{OPT}_W)$ then we are done. Otherwise the triangles satisfying that $P_i \cap L = P_i \cap L_2$ have a total weight of at least $\frac{1}{3}w(\text{OPT}_W)$ and we establish the claim of the lemma by rotating OPT by 180° . \square

If $|\text{OPT}_W| = 1$ then we are done. Therefore, assume now that $P_i \cap L = P_i \cap L_1$ for each $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W$. In the next lemma we prove that by losing a factor of $O(1)$ we can assume that the triangles in OPT_W intersect L_1 in the order of their groups \mathcal{P}_j (assuming that ϵ is a sufficiently small constant). We call such a solution group-respecting as defined below.

Definition. Let $\mathcal{P}' = \{P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_k}\}$ be a solution in which each triangle intersects L_1 and assume w.l.o.g. that the triangles in \mathcal{P}' intersect L_1 in the order P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_k} when going from p_M to p_R . We say that \mathcal{P}' is *group-respecting* if for any two triangles $P_{i_\ell}, P_{i_{\ell+1}} \in \mathcal{P}'$ with $P_{i_\ell} \in \mathcal{P}_j$ and $P_{i_{\ell+1}} \in \mathcal{P}_{j'}$ for some j, j' it holds that $j \leq j'$.

For each $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W$ let d_i denote the length of the intersection of P_i and L_1 in the placement of OPT .

Lemma 31. *If ϵ is sufficiently small, then by losing a factor $O(1)$ we can assume that OPT_W is group-respecting and that $|\text{OPT}_W \cap \mathcal{P}_j| \leq 1$ for each j .*

Proof. Due to Lemma 18 we lose only a factor $O(1)$ by requiring that $|\text{OPT}_W \cap \mathcal{P}_j| \leq 1$ for each j . We prove now that by losing another factor $O(1)$ we can assume that OPT_W is group-respecting.

Let $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_j \cap \mathcal{P}_H$. Let D be the longest edge of P_i in the placement of P_i in OPT_W . Let α be the angle between D and L_1 .

Like in the proof of Lemma 16 we define $r_i := N - \sqrt{\ell_i^2 - N^2}$. Intuitively, using r_i we can define two hexagonal areas $H_1(r_i), H_2(r_i)$ close to the diagonals of the knapsack such that the longest edge of P_i lies within $H_1(r_i)$ or within $H_2(r_i)$. Also, let r'_i denote the length of the line segment $L_1 \cap H_1(r_i)$. Observe that $r'_i = \Theta(r_i)$.

Let \tilde{B}_i denote the rectangle obtained by taking the bounding box B_i of P_i and moving and rotating it such that one of its edges coincides with P_i (in the placement of OPT) inside K . Note that the intersection of \tilde{B}_i and L_1 has length at most $\frac{h_i}{\sin \alpha} \leq \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} h_i \leq 2h_i$ by Proposition 29. Therefore, $d_i \leq 2h_i$. On the other hand, if ϵ is sufficiently small then $h_i \leq O(d_i)$ and thus $d_i = \Theta(h_i)$. Also, it holds that $r_i = \Theta(h'_i)$ and hence $d_i = \Omega(r_i)$. Let γ be a constant such that $d_i \geq \gamma \cdot r_i$ for each $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W$.

Then there exists a constant $\Gamma \geq 1$ such that the following holds. For any two polygons $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W \cap \mathcal{P}_j$, $P_{i'} \in \text{OPT}_W \cap \mathcal{P}_{j'}$ such that $j + \Gamma \leq j'$ we have that $r'_i \leq d_{i'}$ since $r'_i \leq \Omega(r_i) \leq \Omega(r_{i'}) \leq \Omega(d_{i'})$ and for each constant $\gamma \geq 1$ we can guarantee that $r_i \leq \gamma r_{i'}$ if we choose Γ sufficiently large. Let D be the longest edge of $P_{i'}$. Assume w.l.o.g. that D lies within $H_1(r_i)$. However, we have that $r_i \leq d_{i'}$. Since P_i and $P_{i'}$ do not intersect, they must therefore be placed in a group-respecting manner in OPT_W .

We split OPT_W into Γ groups such that for each offset $a \in \{0, \dots, \Gamma - 1\}$ we define $\text{OPT}_W^{(a)} := \text{OPT}_W \cap \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{P}_{a+k\Gamma}$. Therefore, for each solution $\text{OPT}_W^{(a)}$ it holds that for any two distinct polygons $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W^{(a)} \cap \mathcal{P}_j$, $P_{i'} \in \text{OPT}_W^{(a)} \cap \mathcal{P}_{j'}$ for values j, j' it holds that P_i and $P_{i'}$ are placed in a group-respecting manner in OPT_W . Then taking the most profitable solution among the solutions $\{\text{OPT}_W^{(a)}\}_{a \in \{0, \dots, \Gamma-1\}}$ loses at most another factor $\Gamma = O(1)$. \square

For each triangle $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W$ let v_i^* be the vertex adjacent to the two longest edges of P_i in the placement of P_i in OPT . Also, let θ_i denote the angle at v_i^* . We note that there exist only constantly many triangles $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W$ with $\theta_i > \epsilon$.

Lemma 32. *There exist at most $O_\epsilon(1)$ triangles in $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W$ such that $\theta_i > \epsilon$.*

Proof. Let $P_{i_k} \in \text{OPT}_W$. Note that the triangle T with angle θ_i at v_i^* and side lengths $\frac{\ell_i}{2}$ and $\tan \theta_i \frac{\ell_i}{2}$ is contained in P_i (otherwise v_i^* is not adjacent to the two longest sides). Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{area}(P_i) &\geq \text{area}(T) \\ &= \frac{\ell_i^2}{8} \tan \theta_i \\ &> \frac{\ell_i^2}{8} \tan \epsilon \\ &\geq \frac{(\sqrt{2} - \epsilon)^2}{8} N^2 \tan \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence there can only be at most $O_\epsilon(1)$ such triangles in OPT_W . \square

Due to Lemma 32 we assume now $\theta_i \leq \epsilon$ for each $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W$. Furthermore, since each triangle $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W$ is very wide, v_i^* must be close to one of the four corners of K since otherwise the longest edge of P_i does not fit into K . Thus, by losing a factor 4 we assume that v_i^* is close to p_{TL} for each $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W$.

Lemma 33. *By losing a factor 2 we can assume for each $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W$ that $\|v_i^* - p_{TL}\|_2 \leq 2\epsilon N$.*

Proof. Let u, v be the vertices that define ℓ_i . By Claim 2.2 we know that u or v is at distance r_i of some corner v_C of K . Without loss of generality and applying Proposition 29 we assume that $\|v - v_C\| \leq \epsilon N$. Recall that by Proposition 29 $\|u - v\| = \ell_i \geq (\sqrt{2} - \epsilon)N$. Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - v_C\| &= \|u - v - (v_C - v)\| \\ &\geq \|u - v\| - \|v_C - v\| \\ &\geq (\sqrt{2} - \epsilon)N - \epsilon N \\ &= (\sqrt{2} - 2\epsilon)N \end{aligned}$$

Let $B(x, r) := \{p \mid \|x - p\| \leq r\}$ and call $v_{C'}$ the corner furthest away from v_C . Note that $u \in K \setminus B(v_C, (\sqrt{2} - 2\epsilon)N) \subseteq B(v_{C'}, 2\epsilon N)$, from which we conclude that every endpoint of the diagonal is at distance at most $2\epsilon N$ from a corner. In particular v_i^* must be a distance at most $2\epsilon N$ from some corner.

We define $N_{TL} := \{P_i \in \text{OPT}_W \mid \|v_i^* - p_{TL}\|_2 \leq 2\epsilon N\}$ and N_{TL}, N_{BL}, N_{BR} in a similar fashion. These sets partition OPT_W into four sets. Note that one of these sets must have weight at least $\frac{1}{4}w(\text{OPT}_W)$. If this set is N_{TL} we are done. Otherwise, we simply rotate OPT_W accordingly. \square

Due to Lemma 33, if ϵ is sufficiently small we have for each triangle $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W$ that both $R_i^{(1)} \setminus \{v_i^*\}$ and $R_i^{(2)} \setminus \{v_i^*\}$ intersect the right edge of the knapsack or both $R_i^{(1)} \setminus \{v_i^*\}$ and $R_i^{(2)} \setminus \{v_i^*\}$ intersect the bottom edge of the knapsack. We call triangles P_i of the former type *right-facing* triangles and we call the triangles of the latter type *bottom-facing* triangles.

Proposition 34. *If ϵ is sufficiently small, we have that by losing a factor of 2 we can assume that each triangle in OPT_W is right-facing or bottom-facing.*

Assume that $\text{OPT}_W = \{P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_{|\text{OPT}_W|}}\}$. We partition now OPT_W into $g = O(1)$ groups such that each group is top-left-packable. Then the most profitable such group yields a g -approximation. We initialize $\text{OPT}_W^{(1)} := \text{OPT}_W^{(2)} := \dots \text{OPT}_W^{(g)} := \emptyset$ and $k := 0$. Suppose inductively that for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we partitioned the triangles $P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_{k-1}}$ into $\text{OPT}_W^{(1)}, \dots, \text{OPT}_W^{(g)}$ such that each of these sets is top-left-packable. We argue that there is one value $t \in \{1, \dots, g\}$ such that $\text{OPT}_W^{(t)} \cup \{P_{i_k}\}$ is also top-left-packable. To this end, observe that in the top-left-packing of each set $\text{OPT}_W^{(t)}$ each triangle $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W^{(t)}$ blocks a certain portion of L_1 such that no other triangle in this packing can overlap this part of L_1 . To this end, for each triangle $P_i \in \{P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_{k-1}}\}$ let $t(i) \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be the smallest integer t such that if $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W^{(g')}$ for some $g' \in \{1, \dots, g\}$ then in the top-left packing of $\text{OPT}_W^{(g')}$ the longest edge e of P_i lies on the line that contains p_{TL} and p_t . Also, let $t'(i)$ be the smallest integer t' such that $t(i) < t'$ and P_i does not overlap the point $p_{t'}$. Then, after placing P_i we cannot add another triangle in a top-left-packing to $\text{OPT}_W^{(t)}$ that touches the subsegment of L_1 that connects $p_{t(i)}$ with $p_{t'(i)}$. Hence, intuitively P_i blocks the latter subsegment. We define $\hat{d}_i := \|p_{t'(i)} - p_{t(i)}\|_2$. Our crucial insight is now that up to a constant factor, in our top-left packing the triangle P_i blocks as much of L_1 as it covers of L_1 in OPT_W .

Lemma 35. *If ϵ is sufficiently small then for each triangle $P_i \in \text{OPT}_W$ it holds that $\hat{d}_i = O(d_i)$.*

Proof. We argue in a similar way as in the proof of Lemma 31. Let D be the longest edge of P_i in an arbitrary placement of P_i inside K . Let \tilde{d}_i denote the length of the intersection of P_i and L_1 in this placement. Let α be the angle between D and L_1 . Due to Proposition 29 we can assume that $\alpha \in [\pi/4 - \frac{1}{10}, \pi/4 + \frac{1}{10}]$. Hence, if ϵ is a sufficiently small then the intersection of \tilde{B}_i and L_1 has length at most $2h_i$. Therefore, $\tilde{d}_i \leq 2h_i$.




FIGURE 5. The points, line segments, and angles used in the proof of Lemma 36

On the other hand, if ϵ sufficiently small then $h_i \leq O(\tilde{d}_i)$. Hence, $\tilde{d}_i = \Theta(h_i)$ and also $d_i = \Theta(h_i)$ and therefore $\tilde{d}_i = \Theta(d_i)$. Since $h_i \geq h'_i/8$ this implies that $d_i = \Omega(h'_i)$. Also, it holds that $r_i = \Theta(h'_i)$ and D lies in $H_1(r_i)$ or $H_2(r_i)$. Therefore, if n is sufficiently large (which implies that the points p_t are sufficiently dense on L_1) we have that $\hat{d}_i = O(\tilde{d}_i) = O(d_i)$. \square

Lemma 35 implies that if g is a sufficiently large constant then there is a value $t \in \{1, \dots, g\}$ such that $\sum_{P_{i_\ell} \in \text{OPT}_W^{(t)}} \hat{d}_{i_\ell} \leq \sum_{P_{i_\ell} \in \{P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_{k-1}}\}} d_{i_\ell}$. Hence, in the top-left packing for $\text{OPT}_W^{(t)}$ (which at this point contains only triangles from $\{P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_{k-1}}\}$) the triangles block less of L_1 than the amount of L_1 that the triangles $P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_{k-1}}$ cover in OPT_W . On the other hand, we know that in OPT_W the triangle P_{i_k} is placed such that it intersects L_1 further on the right than any triangle in $P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_{k-1}}$ due to Lemma 31. Using this, in the next lemmas we show that we can add P_{i_k} to $\text{OPT}_W^{(t)}$.

Lemma 36. *If each triangle in OPT_W is right-facing we have that $\text{OPT}_W^{(t)} \cup \{P_{i_k}\}$ is top-left-packable.*

Proof. Let $s^* = \sum_{P_{i_\ell} \in \text{OPT}_W^{(t)}} \hat{d}_{i_\ell}$ and $s = (s^* + N/2, N/2)$. Consider now $p(z) = (z, N)$ and define the point $p^f(z) = (p_x^f(z), p_y^f(z))$ as the intersection between the right side of the Knapsack and $\overline{p(z)s}$. Similarly, define $p^g(z) = (p_x^g(z), p_y^g(z))$ as the intersection between $\{N\} \times \mathbb{R}$ and the line L^θ obtained by rotating $\overline{p(z)s}$ around $p(z)$ by $\theta := \theta_{i_k}$ counterclockwise. Note that every polygon in $\text{OPT}_W^{(t)}$ is contained in $H^- := K \cap \text{conv}(\{p_{TL}, p^f(0), p_{BR}, p_{BL}\})$ as they are top-left-packed.

We translate P_{i_k} upwards until it intersects the top side of the knapsack at a point (z^*, N) . By Lemma 33 we get that $z^* \in [0, 2\epsilon N]$. Note that now P_{i_k} is placed inside the triangle $p(z^*), p^f(z^*), p^g(z^*)$. Define now $f(z) := \|p(z) - p^f(z)\|^2$, $g(z) := \|p(z) - p^g(z)\|^2$. Note that it suffices to prove that $f(0) \geq f(t)$ and $g(0) \geq g(t)$ for each $t \in [0, 2\epsilon N]$ as this implies that P_{i_k} can be placed inside the triangle with vertices $p(0), p^f(0), p^g(0)$, this triangle is contained in $K \setminus H^-$ and this placement is group respecting.

Since $\frac{N}{2} + s^* - z \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - 2\epsilon\right)N > 0$ and $N - z \geq (1 - 2\epsilon)N > 0$, a similarity argument between triangles $p(z), (z, p_y^f(z)), p^f(z)$ and $p(z), (z, N/2), s$ lets us obtain:

$$\frac{\frac{N}{2}}{\frac{N}{2} + s^* - z} = \frac{N - p_y^f(z)}{N - z}. \quad (1)$$

As $p_y^f(z) \geq 0$ we obtain $N - z \leq N + 2s^* - 2z$, implying that $z \leq 2s^*$ and therefore we only need to prove that $f(0) \geq f(z)$ for each $z \in [0, \min\{\epsilon N, 2s^*\}]$. Pythagoras theorem on $p(z), p^f(z), p_{TR}$ gives us:

$$f(z) = (N - z)^2 + (N - p_y^f(z))^2 \quad (2)$$

Combining 1 and 2 we get:

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) &= (N - z)^2 + (N - p_y^f(z))^2 \\ &= (N - z)^2 \left(1 + \frac{N^2}{(N + 2s^* - 2z)^2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

We now compute $f'(z)$.

$$\begin{aligned} f'(z) &= -2(N - z) \left(1 + \frac{N^2}{(N + 2s^* - 2z)^2}\right) + (N - z)^2 \left(\frac{4N^2}{(N + 2s^* - 2z)^3}\right) \\ &= \frac{(N - z)}{(N + 2s^* - 2z)^3} \left(-2(N + 2s^* - 2z)^3 - 2N^2(N + 2s^* - 2z) + 4N^2(N - z)\right) \end{aligned}$$

Note that $f'(z) = 0$ if and only if $\phi(z) := 4N^2(N - z) - 2(N + 2s^* - 2z)^3 - 2N^2(N + 2s^* - 2z) = 0$. After some algebra we obtain the following:

$$\phi(z) = z^3 \cdot 16 + z^2(-48s^* - 24N) + z(48(s^*)^2 + 48s^*N + 12N^2) - 16N^2s^* - 24N(s^*)^2 - 16(s^*)^3$$

We can compute the discriminant of this polynomial and obtain:

$$\Delta_\phi = -27684(N^6 - 4N^5s^* + 4N^4(s^*)^2) = -27684N^4(N - 2s^*)^2 < 0$$

since $s^* < \frac{N}{2}$ (as OPT_W intersects L_1 by at least s^* and the amount P_{i_k} intersects L_1). Therefore ϕ has a unique real root \bar{z} . Note that $\max_{z \in [0, 2s^*]} f(z) \in \{f(0), f(2s^*), f(\bar{z})\}$. We begin by showing that $f(0) \geq f(2s^*)$. Indeed:

$$\begin{aligned} f(0) - f(2s^*) &= N^2 \left(1 + \frac{N^2}{(N + 2s^*)^2}\right) - (N - 2s^*)^2 \left(1 + \frac{N^2}{(N - 2s^*)^2}\right) \\ &= \frac{N^4 - (N + 2s^*)^2(N - 2s^*)^2}{(N + 2s^*)} \\ &= \frac{N^4 - (N^2 - (2s^*)^2)^2}{(N + 2s^*)} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\max_{z \in [0, 2s^*]} f(z) \in \{f(0), f(\bar{z})\}$. If $\bar{z} \notin [0, 2s^*]$, then it is clear that $f(0) = \max_{z \in [0, 2s^*]} f(z)$. Suppose then that $\bar{z} \in [0, 2s^*]$. Since:

$$f'(0) = \frac{N}{(N + 2s^*)^3} \left(-2(N + 2s^*)^3 - 2N^2(N + 2s^*) + 4N^3\right) \leq 0,$$

then $f'(z) \leq 0$ for $z \in [0, \bar{z}]$ by continuity. Therefore f is decreasing in $[0, \bar{z}]$ concluding that $f(0) \geq f(\bar{z})$ and that $f(0) \geq f(z)$ for $z \in [0, \min\{2\epsilon N, 2s^*\}]$.

Let $\alpha := \alpha(z)$ be the angle between L and $\overline{p(z)p^f(z)}$. Let $u(z) = (u_x(z), u_y(z))$ be the placement of the vertex of P_{i_k} that is not adjacent to the longest edge. We aim to show that $u(0) \in K$ implying that P_{i_k} is placed inside the Knapsack. By examining the triangle $p(0), (z, p_y^g(0)), p^g(0)$ we get that $\tan(\alpha(0) + \theta) = \frac{\|p^g(0) - (0, p_y^g(z))\|}{\|p(0) - (0, p_y^g(z))\|} = \frac{N}{|N - p^g(0)|}$.

Furthermore by applying the law of sines on triangle $p(0), p^f(0), p^g(0)$ we get:

$$\frac{\sin \theta}{\|p^g(0) - p^f(0)\|} = \frac{\sin \alpha(0)}{\|p^g(0) - p(0)\|}$$

Therefore $\|p^g(0) - p^f(0)\| = \frac{\|p^g(0) - p(0)\| \sin \theta}{\sin \alpha(0)} \leq \frac{\sin \theta \ell_i}{\sin \alpha(0)} \leq \frac{\epsilon \sqrt{2}}{\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} - \epsilon} N$. By choosing ϵ small enough we assume that $\|p^g(0) - p^f(0)\| \leq \frac{1}{10} N$. Note that by choosing ϵ small enough $\tan(\alpha(0) + \theta) \leq (1 + \frac{1}{10})$. Therefore:

$$N \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{10}\right) |N - p^g(0)|$$

Which implies that $p_y^g(0) \leq \frac{1}{10} N$ or $p_y^g(0) \geq \frac{21}{10} N$. If $p_y^g(0) \geq \frac{21}{10} N$ then $p^f(0)_y \geq \frac{20}{10} N$ which is not possible. We conclude that $p_y^g(0) \leq \frac{1}{10} N$ and since $u(0) \in \text{conv}(\{p^g(0), p(0)\})$ we conclude that $0 \leq u_y(0) \leq N$. It only remains to prove that the same holds for $u_x(0)$.

Let $u'(z) = (u'_x(z), u'_y(z))$ be the vertex of P_{i_k} that is not u or $v_{i_k}^*$. Let θ' be the angle of P_{i_k} at u' and $\beta(z)$ the angle between $\overline{uu'}$ and $\{u'_y(z)\} \times [u'_x(z), \infty)$. Note that $\beta(z) + \theta' + \frac{\pi}{2} - \alpha(z) = \pi$, therefore $\alpha'(z) = \beta'(z)$. By examining the triangle $p(z), s, (z, N/2)$ we obtain that $\tan(\alpha(z)) = \frac{\|s - (z, N/2)\|}{\|p(z) - (z, N/2)\|} = \frac{N + 2s^* - 2z}{N} = 1 + 2\frac{s^* - z}{N}$. Therefore:

$$\beta'(z) = \alpha'(z) = \frac{-\frac{2}{N}}{1 + (1 + 2\frac{s^* - z}{N})^2} \leq 0$$

We conclude that $\beta(0) \geq \beta(z)$ for each other z . Call $\ell' = \|u' - u\|$ and $R(\beta)$ the rotation matrix by β , then: $u(z) = u'(z) + R(\beta(z)) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \ell' \end{pmatrix}$.

In particular $u_y(0) = u'(0) - \sin(\beta(0))\ell' \leq u'(z^*) - \sin(\beta(z^*))\ell' \leq u_y(z^*) \leq N$, from which we conclude. \square

Lemma 37. *If each triangle in OPT_W is bottom-facing we have that $\text{OPT}_W^{(t)} \cup \{P_{i_k}\}$ is bottom-right-packable.*

Proof. Let $s^* = \sum_{P_{i_\ell} \in \text{OPT}_W^t} \hat{d}_{i_\ell}$, $s^r = (s^* + \frac{N}{2}, \frac{N}{2})$ and $s^\ell = (s^* + \frac{N}{2}, \frac{N}{2})$. We define $p(z)$ as (z, N) . Define $p^f(z)$ as the intersection between $\overline{p(z)s^r}$ and the bottom edge of K . Similarly, let L^θ be the rotation of $\overline{p(z)s^r}$ by θ counterclockwise and call $p^g(z)$ the intersection between L^θ and the bottom edge. Let also $T(z)$ the triangle $p(z), p^f(z), p^g(z)$. We begin by rotating $\text{OPT}_W^{(t)}$ by 180° around p_M .

We now translate P_{i_k} upwards until it intersects the top-edge of the Knapsack at $p(z^*)$ for some z^* . Note that P_{i_k} is contained inside the triangle $T(z^*)$.

Let I be the amount $T(z^*)$ intersects L . A similarity argument between $T(z^*)$ and $(z^*, N), (z^*, N/2), s^r + (I, 0)$ gives us:

$$\frac{1}{2} = \frac{N/2 + s^* - z^* + I}{p^g(z) - z^*}$$

Since $p^g(z^*) \leq N$ we obtain $2s + 2I \leq z^*$.

We now translate P_{i_k} to the left until $v_{i_k}^*$ coincides with p_{TL} . Let $q = (q_x, q_y)$ be the rightmost point in $P_{i_k} \cap L$. Since $2s + 2I \leq z^*$ we know that $q_x \leq \frac{N}{2} - s$. Therefore P_{i_k} is placed to the left of the line L^* that passes through v_{TL} and s^ℓ . Furthermore, $\text{OPT}_W^{(t)}$ is to the right of L^* as they are bottom-right packed. We now rotate P_{i_k} counterclockwise around $v_{i_k}^*$ until it overlaps

s^ℓ . Finally, by rotating $\text{OPT}_W^{(t)} \cup \{P_{i_k}\}$ 180° around p_M we arrive at a bottom-right packing of $\text{OPT}_W^{(t)} \cup \{P_{i_k}\}$. \square

We add P_{i_k} to $\text{OPT}_W^{(t)}$. We continue iteratively until we assigned all triangles in OPT_W to the sets $\text{OPT}_W^{(1)}, \dots, \text{OPT}_W^{(g)}$. Then the most profitable set $\text{OPT}_W^{(t^*)}$ among them satisfies that $w(\text{OPT}_W^{(t^*)}) \geq \frac{1}{g}w(\text{OPT}_W)$. On the other hand, $w(P_{i^*}) \geq \Omega(w(\text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{P}_H \setminus \text{OPT}_W))$. Hence, $w(\text{OPT}_W^{(t^*)}) \geq \frac{1}{g}w(\text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{P}_H)$ or $w(P_{i^*}) \geq \Omega(w(\text{OPT} \cap \mathcal{P}_H))$ which completes the proof of Lemma 22.

2.5. Hard polygons under resource augmentation. Let $\delta > 0$. We consider the setting of $(1 + \delta)$ -resource augmentation, i.e., we want to compute a solution $\mathcal{P}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ that is feasible for a knapsack of size $(1 + \delta)N \times (1 + \delta)N$ and such that $w(\text{OPT}) \leq O(w(\mathcal{P}'))$ where OPT is the optimal solution for the original knapsack of size $N \times N$. Note that increasing K by a factor of $1 + \delta$ is equivalent to shrinking the input polygons by a factor of $1 + \delta$.

Given a polygon P defined via coordinates $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_k, y_k) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ we define $\text{shr}_{1+\delta}(P)$ to be the polygon with coordinates $(\bar{x}_1, \bar{y}_1), \dots, (\bar{x}_k, \bar{y}_k) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ where $\bar{x}_{k'} = x_{k'}/(1 + \delta)$ and $\bar{y}_{k'} = y_{k'}/(1 + \delta)$ for each k' . For each input polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ we define its shrunk counterpart to be $\bar{P}_i := \text{shr}_{1+\delta}(P_i)$. Based on $\bar{\mathcal{P}}$ we define sets $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_E, \bar{\mathcal{P}}_M, \bar{\mathcal{P}}_H$ and the set $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_j$ for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ in the same way as we defined $\mathcal{P}_E, \mathcal{P}_M, \mathcal{P}_H$ and \mathcal{P}_j based on \mathcal{P} above.

For the sets $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_E$ and $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_M$ we use the algorithms due to Lemmas 6 and 7 as before. For the hard polygons $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_H$ we can show that there are only $O_\delta(1)$ groups $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_j$ that are non-empty, using that we obtained them via shrinking the original input polygons. Intuitively, this is true since $\bar{\ell}_i \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}N}{1+\delta}$ for each $\bar{P}_i \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}$ where $\bar{\ell}_i$ denotes the length of the longest diagonal of \bar{P}_i , and hence $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_j \cap \bar{\mathcal{P}}_H = \emptyset$ if $j < \log\left(\frac{\delta}{1+\delta}\sqrt{2}N\right)$.

Lemma 38. *We have that $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_j = \emptyset$ if $j < \log\left(\frac{\delta}{1+\delta}\sqrt{2}N\right)$. Hence, there are only $\log\left(\frac{1+\delta}{\delta}\right) + 1$ values $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_j \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let P_i be an arbitrary polygon. Note that $\bar{\ell}_i = \frac{1}{1+\delta}\ell_i$, and therefore $\bar{\ell}_i \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}N}{1+\delta}$. We conclude that $\frac{\delta}{1+\delta}\sqrt{2}N \leq \sqrt{2}N - \bar{\ell}_i \leq \sqrt{2}N$. Note that, for any j , if $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_j$ is non-empty, there must be a P_i that satisfies $\sqrt{2}N - 2^j \leq \bar{\ell}_i < \sqrt{2}N - 2^{j-1}$ (or equivalently $2^{j-1} < \sqrt{2}N - \bar{\ell}_i \leq 2^j$). We conclude that such j 's must verify $\log\left(\frac{\delta}{1+\delta}\sqrt{2}N\right) \leq j < \log(2\sqrt{2}N)$ and therefore there are at most $\log(2\sqrt{2}N) - \log\left(\frac{\delta}{1+\delta}\sqrt{2}N\right) = \log\left(\frac{1+\delta}{\delta}\right) + 1$ non-empty $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_j$. \square

Lemmas 18 and 38 imply that $|\overline{\text{OPT}} \cap \bar{\mathcal{P}}_H| \leq O(\log\left(\frac{1+\delta}{\delta}\right))$ where $\overline{\text{OPT}}$ denotes the optimal solution for the polygons in $\bar{\mathcal{P}}$. Let $\bar{\mathcal{P}}'_H \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{P}}_H$ denote the set due to Lemma 19 when assuming that $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_H$ are the hard polygons in the given instance. Therefore, we guess $\bar{\mathcal{P}}'_H$ in time $n^{O(\log(\frac{1+\delta}{\delta}))}$. Finally, we output the solution of largest weight among $\bar{\mathcal{P}}'_H$ and the solutions due applying to Lemmas 6 and 7 to the input sets $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_E$ and $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_M$, respectively. This yields the proof of Theorem 3.

3. OPTIMAL PROFIT UNDER RESOURCE AUGMENTATION

In this section we also study the setting of $(1 + \delta)$ -resource augmentation, i.e., we want to compute a solution \mathcal{P}' which is feasible for an enlarged knapsack of size $(1 + \delta)N \times (1 + \delta)N$, for any constant $\delta > 0$. We present an algorithm with a running time of $n^{(\log(n)/\delta)^{O(1)}}$ that computes such a solution \mathcal{P}' with $w(\mathcal{P}') \geq \text{OPT}$ where OPT is the optimal solution for the original




FIGURE 6. The points and rectangles used in the proof of Lemma 40.

knapsack of size $N \times N$. In particular, we here do not lose any factor in our approximation guarantee.

First, we prove a set of properties that we can assume “by $(1 + \delta)$ -resource augmentation” meaning that if we increase the size of K by a factor $1 + \delta$ then there exists a solution of weight $w(\text{OPT})$ with the mentioned properties, or that we can modify the input in time $n^{O(1)}$ such that it has these properties and there still exists a solution of weight $w(\text{OPT})$.

3.1. Few types of items. We want to establish that the input polygons have only $(\log(n)/\delta)^{O(1)}$ different shapes. Like in Section 2 for each polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ denote by B_i its bounding box with width ℓ_i and height h_i . Note that $\ell_i \geq h_i$. The bounding boxes of all polygons $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $h_i \leq \delta \frac{N}{n}$ have a total height of at most δN . Therefore, we can pack all these polygons into the extra capacity that we gain by increasing the size of K by a factor $1 + \delta$ and therefore ignore them in the sequel.

Lemma 39. *By $(1 + \delta)$ -resource augmentation we can assume for each $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ that $\ell_i \geq h_i \geq \delta N/n$ and that $\text{area}(P_i) = \Omega(\text{area}(K)\delta^2/n^2)$.*

Proof. Let v_1, v_2 be the two vertices that define h_i . Note that $d(v_1, v_2) \geq h_i$ by the triangle inequality and $d(v_1, v_2) \leq \ell_i$ by definition, concluding that $\ell_i \geq h_i$. Additionally, let \mathcal{P}_{thin} be the polygons P_i that satisfy $h_i \leq \delta \frac{N}{n}$. Note that $\sum_{P_i \in \mathcal{P}_{thin}} h_i \leq \delta N$, and therefore, we can pack these polygons into the extra capacity. Finally, by Lemma 10 $\text{area}(P_i) \geq \frac{1}{2} \ell_i h_i = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta^2 N^2}{n^2}$ for each remaining polygon P_i . \square

Next, intuitively we stretch the optimal solution OPT by a factor $1 + \delta$ which yields a container C_i for each polygon $P_i \in \text{OPT}$ which contains P_i and which is slightly bigger than P_i . We define a polygon P'_i such that $P_i \subseteq P'_i \subseteq C_i$ and that globally there are only $(\log(n)/\delta)^{O_\delta(1)}$ different ways P'_i can look like, up to translations and rotations. We refer to those as a set \mathcal{S} of *shapes* of input objects. Hence, due to the resource augmentation we can replace each input polygon P_i by one of the shapes in \mathcal{S} .

Lemma 40. *By $(1 + \delta)$ -resource augmentation we can assume that there is a set of shapes \mathcal{S} with $|\mathcal{S}| \leq (\log(n)/\delta)^{O_\delta(1)}$ such that for each $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ there is a shape $S \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $P_i = S$ and S has only $\Lambda = (1/\delta)^{O(1)}$ many vertices.*

Proof. Let P be an input polygon. Assume that P is rotated such that its longest diagonal is horizontal, i.e., let $p = (p_x, p_y), q = (q_x, q_y)$ denote the vertices of P with largest distance; we assume that p and q lie on a horizontal line, i.e., that $p_y = q_y$. Furthermore, let $r = (r_x, r_y), s = (s_x, s_y)$ denote the vertices of P with minimum and maximum y -coordinate, respectively (see Figure 6).

Note that extending the knapsack by a factor $1 + \delta$ is equivalent to shrinking each input polygon by a factor $1 + \delta$. Let $\text{shr}_{1+\delta}(P)$ denote the polygon obtained by shrinking P towards the origin, i.e., by replacing each vertex $v = (v_x, v_y)$ of P by the vertex $v' = (\frac{v_x}{1+\delta}, \frac{v_y}{1+\delta})$. Our goal is to show that there exists a polygon P' whose shape is one shape out of $(\log(n)/\delta)^{O_\delta(1)}$ options such that there is a translation vector \vec{a} with $\vec{a} + \text{shr}_{1+\delta}(P) \subseteq P' \subseteq P$. Then we replace in the input the polygon P by a polygon \tilde{P} which is congruent to P' . Hence, for the shapes of the resulting polygons \tilde{P} there are only $(\log(n)/\delta)^{O_\delta(1)}$ options. In the process, we will shrink P a constant number of times. Then the claim follows by redefining δ accordingly.

First, we shrink P by a factor of at most $1 + \delta$ such that the line segment connecting p and q has a length that is a power of $1 + \delta$. Let ℓ'_i denote this new length. Since originally $\sqrt{2}N \geq \ell_i \geq \delta N/n$ there are only $O(\log_{1+\delta} n)$ options for ℓ'_i . We partition the bounding box of P into four rectangles where

- R_1 is the (unique) rectangle with vertices s and q ,
- R_2 is the (unique) rectangle with vertices r and q ,
- R_3 is the (unique) rectangle with vertices p and r , and
- R_4 is the (unique) rectangle with vertices p and s .

We translate P such that p is the origin. If the width of R_1 is smaller than $\delta\ell'_i$ then intuitively we shrink P by a factor $1 + \delta$ towards p such that q_x is again a power of $1 + \delta$ and $s_x = q_x$. More formally, we replace each vertex $v = (v_x, v_y)$ of P by a vertex $v' = (v'_x, v'_y)$ such that $v'_x = \alpha v_x$ and $v'_y = \alpha v_y$ for some value $\alpha \in (\frac{1}{1+\delta}, 1]$. First, we move q towards p such that q_x is the next smaller power of $1 + \delta$. Then we move s towards p such that $s_x = q_x$. Finally, we move each remaining vertex v by exactly a factor $1 + \delta$ towards p . As a result, R_1 becomes empty. We perform similar operations in case that the width of R_2, R_3 , or R_4 is smaller than $\delta\ell'_i$. Also, we perform a similar operation in case that the height of R_1 (identical to the height of R_4) is smaller than δh_i or that the height of R_2 (identical to the height of R_3) is smaller than δh_i . In the latter operations we move the vertices of P towards s or r , respectively.

Assume again that p is the origin. Let $t := (s_x, p_y)$. Let $t' = (t'_x, t'_y)$ such that $t'_y = p_y$, and t'_x is the smallest value t'_x with $t'_x \geq t_x$ such that the distance between t' and q is a multiple of $\delta^3\ell'_i$. In particular, then $t'_x - t_x \leq \delta^3\ell'_i \leq \delta^2(q_x - t_x)$ and note that $q_x - t_x$ is the width of R_1 for which $q_x - t_x \geq \delta\ell'_i$ holds.

We define $s' = (s'_x, s'_y)$ such that $s'_x = t'_x$ and s'_y is that largest value s'_y such that $s' = (s'_x, s'_y)$ lies inside P . Observe that $s'_y \geq (1 - \delta^2)s_y$ since P includes all points on the line segment connecting s and q by convexity. Similarly, we define a point t'' between p and t and a corresponding point s'' . We move each vertex $v = (v_x, v_y)$ of P towards t that satisfy that $t''_x \leq v_x \leq t'_x$ and $v_y \geq t''_y = t_y = t'_y$, i.e., we reduce the distance between v and t by a factor $1/(1 + \delta)$ which we justify via shrinking. One can show that afterwards v lies in the convex hull spanned by the other vertices of P and s' and s'' , using that $s'_y \geq (1 - \delta^2)s_y \geq (1 - \delta^2)v_y$. Hence, we can remove v .

We move P such that t' becomes the origin. Let R'_1 denote the (unique) rectangle with vertices s' and q . Our goal is now to move the vertices within R'_1 such that only $O_\delta(1)$ vertices remain and that for the coordinate of each of them there are only $(\log(n)/\delta)^{O_\delta(1)}$ options. Whenever we move a vertex v within R'_1 we move v towards t' such that the distance between v and t' decreases by at most a factor $1 + \delta$ but keep s' and q unchanged. In this way the distance between t' and q does not change and the distance between t' and s' does not change either. Let h denote the distance between t' and s' and let w denote the distance between t' and q . Assume




FIGURE 7. The points and rays related to the shrinking of R_1 . In gray we see the shrunk polygon and in white the original.

w.l.o.g. that $h = w = 1$ and that t' is the origin. Observe that by convexity each point on the line segment connecting s' and q lies within P .

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be a constant with $k = O_\delta(1)$ to be defined later. We shoot rays r_0, \dots, r_k originating at t' such that r_0 goes through s' , r_k goes through q , and between any two consecutive rays r_j, r_{j+1} there is an angle of exactly $\frac{\pi}{2k}$ (see Figure 7). For each $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ denote by v_j the point on the boundary of P that is intersected by r_j (not necessarily a vertex of P). Imagine that we shrink P such that we move each vertex $v = (v_x, v_y)$ of P towards $t' = 0$, i.e., we replace v by the point $v' := (\frac{v_x}{1+\delta}, \frac{v_y}{1+\delta})$. We argue that v' lies in the convex hull of t', v_0, \dots, v_k and hence we can remove v' . Let r be a ray originating at t' and going through v . Suppose that r_j and r_{j+1} are the rays closest to r . Let $v_j = (v_j^x, v_j^y)$ and $v_{j+1} = (v_{j+1}^x, v_{j+1}^y)$. Then v lies in the convex hull of v_j, v_{j+1} and the point (v_{j+1}^x, v_j^y) . We have that $v_j^x \geq 1/3$ and $v_{j+1}^y \geq 1/3$ or that $v_j^y \geq 1/3$ and $v_{j+1}^x \geq 1/3$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $v_j^x \geq 1/3$ and $v_{j+1}^y \geq 1/3$. We claim that then $v_j^x \leq v_x \leq v_{j+1}^x \leq (1+\delta)v_j^x$. The first two inequalities follow from convexity. For proving that $v_{j+1}^x \leq (1+\delta)v_j^x$, we can assume that $v_j^x \leq 1/(1+\delta)$ since otherwise the claim is immediate. This implies that $v_j^y \geq \Omega(\delta)$. Also observe that $v_{j+1}^y \leq v_j^y$ since otherwise v_j would not be on the boundary of P , by convexity. Therefore, v_{j+1}^x cannot be larger than the x -coordinate of the point on r_{j+1} with y -coordinate v_j^y . Using that $1/(1+\delta) \geq v_j^x \geq 1/3$ one can show that there is a choice for $k \in O_\delta(1)$ that ensures that $v_{j+1}^x \leq (1+\delta)v_j^x$. Finally, for each point v_j with $j \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ we move v_j towards t' such that the distance between v_j and t' becomes a power of $1+\delta$. Since before the shrinking this distance $\Omega(1)$ there are only $O_\delta(1)$ options for the resulting distance.

In a similar way we define R'_2, R'_3 , and R'_4 and perform a symmetric operation on them. The resulting polygon is defined via ℓ'_i , the positions of t', t'' , the positions of the vertices u' and u'' (which are defined analogously to t' and t''), for R'_1 the distance between t' and s' and the distances of the $O_\delta(1)$ vertices v_j to t' , and the respective values for R'_2, R'_3 , and R'_4 . For each of these values there are only $(\log(n)/\delta)^{O_\delta(1)}$ options and there are $O_\delta(1)$ such values in total. Hence, there are $(\log(n)/\delta)^{O_\delta(1)}$ possibilities for the resulting shape. \square

Finally, we ensure that for each polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ we can restrict ourselves to only $(n/\delta)^{O(1)}$ possible placements in K .

Lemma 41. *By $(1 + \delta)$ -resource augmentation, for each polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P}$ we can compute a set \mathcal{L}_i of at most $(n/\delta)^{O(1)}$ possible placements for P_i in time $(n/\delta)^{O(1)}$ such that if $P_i \in \text{OPT}$ then in OPT the polygon P_i is placed inside K according to one placement $\tilde{P}_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$.*

Proof. First, we prove that for each polygon P_i it suffices to allow only $(n/\delta)^{O(1)}$ possible vectors d when defining its placement \tilde{P}_i as $\tilde{P}_i = d + \text{rot}_\alpha(P_i)$. To this end, assume that $\text{OPT} = \{P_1, \dots, P_k\}$. For each polygon $P_i \in \text{OPT}$ denote by \tilde{P}_i its corresponding placement in OPT . We assume that for any $\tilde{P}_i, \tilde{P}_{i'}$ with $i < i'$ it holds that intuitively \tilde{P}_i lies on the left of $\tilde{P}_{i'}$. Formally, we require that if there is a horizontal line L that has non-empty intersection with both \tilde{P}_i and $\tilde{P}_{i'}$ then $L \cap \tilde{P}_i$ lies on the left of $L \cap \tilde{P}_{i'}$. Since the polygons are convex such an ordering exists.

Now for each $k' \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ we move $\tilde{P}_{k'}$ by $k' \cdot \frac{\delta}{n}N$ units to the right. Since $k \leq n$ the resulting placement fits into the knapsack using $(1 + \delta)$ -resource augmentation. Intuitively, in the resulting placement, each polygon \tilde{P}_i has $\frac{\delta}{n}N$ units of empty space on its left and on its right.

In a similar fashion we move all polygons up such that they still fit into the knapsack under $(1 + \delta)$ -resource augmentation and intuitively, each polygon has $\frac{\delta}{n}N$ units of empty space above and below it. For each polygon P_i let v_i be its first vertex $(x'_{i,1}, y'_{i,1})$. We move each polygon \tilde{P}_i such that v_i is placed on a point whose coordinates are integral multiples of $\frac{\delta}{4n}N$. For achieving this, it suffices to move \tilde{P}_i by at most $\frac{\delta}{4n}N$ units down and by at most $\frac{\delta}{4n}N$ units to the left. By the above, we can do this for all polygons simultaneously without making them intersect. Also, intuitively each polygon still has $\frac{\delta}{4n}N$ units of empty space around it in all four directions.

Now we argue that we can rotate each polygon \tilde{P}_i such that its angle is one out of $(n/\delta)^{O(1)}$ many possible angles. Consider a polygon \tilde{P}_i . Suppose that we rotate it around its vertex v_i . We want to argue that if we rotate \tilde{P}_i by an angle of at most $\frac{\delta}{16n}$ then this moves each vertex of \tilde{P}_i by at most $\frac{\delta}{4n}N$ units. Let v'_i be a vertex of \tilde{P}_i with $v_i \neq v'_i$. Let x denote the distance between the old and the new position of v'_i if we rotate \tilde{P}_i by an angle of α . Then we have that $x = \sin \alpha \frac{|v_i v'_i|}{\sin((\pi - \alpha)/2)} \leq 4N\alpha \leq \frac{\delta}{4n}N$, assuming that $\alpha \leq \frac{\delta}{16n}$ and that δ is sufficiently small.

Therefore, we rotate \tilde{P}_i around v_i by an angle of at most $\frac{\delta}{16n}$ such that $d + \text{rot}_\alpha(P_i) = \tilde{P}_i$ for an angle α which is an integral multiple of $\frac{\delta}{16n}$. Due to our movement of \tilde{P}_i before we can assume that $d = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 \\ d_2 \end{pmatrix}$ satisfies that d_1 and d_2 are integral multiples of $\frac{\delta}{4n}N$. Thus, for d and for α there are only $(n/\delta)^{O(1)}$ possibilities which yields only $(n/\delta)^{O(1)}$ possible placements for P_i . \square

3.2. Recursive algorithm. We describe our main algorithm. First, we guess how many polygons of each of the shapes in \mathcal{S} are contained in OPT . Since there are only $(\log(n)/\delta)^{O_\delta(1)}$ different shapes in \mathcal{S} we can do this in time $n^{(\log(n)/\delta)^{O_\delta(1)}}$. Once we know how many polygons of each shape we need to select, it is clear which polygons we should take since if for some shape $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$ we need to select n_i polygons with that shape then it is optimal to select the n_i polygons in \mathcal{P} of shape S_i with largest weight. Therefore, in the sequel assume that we are given a set of polygons $\mathcal{P}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ and we want to find a packing for them inside K .

Our algorithm is recursive and it generalizes a similar algorithm for the special case of axis-parallel rectangles in [AW14]. On a high level, we guess a partition of K given by a separator Γ which is a polygon inside K . It has the property that at most $\frac{2}{3}|\text{OPT}|$ of the polygons of OPT lie inside Γ and at most $\frac{2}{3}|\text{OPT}|$ of the polygons of OPT lie outside Γ . We guess how many polygons of each shape are placed inside and outside Γ in OPT . Then we recurse separately

inside and outside Γ . For our partition, we are looking for a polygon Γ according to the following definition.

Definition. Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Let $\bar{\mathcal{P}}$ be a set of pairwise non-overlapping polygons in K . A polygon Γ is a *balanced $\hat{\epsilon}$ -cheap ℓ -cut* if

- Γ has at most ℓ edges,
- the polygons contained in Γ have a total area of at most $2/3 \cdot \text{area}(\bar{\mathcal{P}})$,
- the polygons contained in the complement of Γ , i.e., in $K \setminus \Gamma$, have a total area of at most $2/3 \cdot \text{area}(\bar{\mathcal{P}})$, and
- the polygons intersecting the boundary of Γ have a total area of at most $\hat{\epsilon} \cdot \text{area}(\bar{\mathcal{P}})$.

In order to restrict the set of balanced cheap cuts to consider, we will allow only polygons Γ such that each of its vertices is contained in a set Q of size $(n/\delta)^{O(1)}$ defined as follows. We fix a triangulation for each placement $P'_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$ of each polygon $P_i \in \mathcal{P}'$. We define a set Q_0 where for each placement $P'_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$ for P_i we add to Q_0 the positions of the vertices of P'_i . Also, we add the four corners of K to Q_0 . Let \mathcal{V} denote the set of vertical lines $\{(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) | \bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}\}$ such that \bar{x} is the x -coordinate of one point in Q_0 . We define a set Q_1 where for each placement $P'_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$ of each $P_i \in \mathcal{P}'$, each edge e of a triangle in the triangulation of P'_i , and each vertical line $L \in \mathcal{V}$ we add to Q_1 the intersection of e and L . Also, we add to Q_1 the intersection of each line in $L \in \mathcal{V}$ with the two boundary edges of K . Let Q_2 denote the set of all intersections of pairs of line segments whose respective endpoints are in $Q_0 \cup Q_1$. We define $Q := Q_0 \cup Q_1 \cup Q_2$. A result in [AW14] implies that there exists a balanced cheap cut whose vertices are all contained in Q .

Lemma 42 ([AW14]). *Let $\epsilon > 0$ and let \mathcal{P}' be a set of pairwise non-intersecting polygons in the plane with at most Λ edges each such that $\text{area}(P) < \text{area}(\mathcal{P}')/3$ for each $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Then there exists a balanced $O(\epsilon\Lambda)$ -cheap $\Lambda(\frac{1}{\epsilon})^{O(1)}$ -cut Γ whose vertices are contained in Q .*

Our algorithm is recursive and places polygons from \mathcal{P}' , trying to maximize the total area of the placed polygons. In each recursive call we are given an area $\bar{K} \subseteq K$ and a set of polygons $\bar{\mathcal{P}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}'$. In the main call these parameters are $\bar{K} = K$ and $\bar{\mathcal{P}} = \mathcal{P}'$. If $\bar{\mathcal{P}} = \emptyset$ then we return an empty solution. If there is a polygon $P_i \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}$ with $\text{area}(P_i) \geq \text{area}(\bar{\mathcal{P}})/3$ then we guess a placement $P'_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$ and we recurse on the area $\bar{K} \setminus P'_i$ and on the set $\bar{\mathcal{P}} \setminus \{P_i\}$. Otherwise, we guess the balanced cheap cut Γ due to Lemma 42 with $\epsilon := \frac{\delta}{\Lambda \log(n/\delta)}$ and for each shape $S \in \mathcal{S}$ we guess how many polygons of \mathcal{P}' with shape S are contained in $\Gamma \cap \bar{K}$, how many are contained in $\bar{K} \setminus \Gamma$, and how many cross the boundary of Γ (i.e., have non-empty intersection with the boundary of Γ). Note that there are only $n^{(\Lambda \log(n/\delta))^{O(1)}}$ possibilities to enumerate. Let $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{in}}, \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{out}}$, and $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{cross}}$ denote the respective sets of polygons. Then we recurse on the area $\Gamma \cap \bar{K}$ with input polygons $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{in}}$ and on the area $\bar{K} \setminus \Gamma$ with input polygons $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{out}}$. Suppose that the recursive calls return two sets of polygons $\bar{\mathcal{P}}'_{\text{in}} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{in}}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{P}}'_{\text{out}} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{out}}$ that the algorithm managed to place inside the respective areas $\Gamma \cap \bar{K}$ and $\bar{K} \setminus \Gamma$. Then we return the set $\bar{\mathcal{P}}'_{\text{in}} \cup \bar{\mathcal{P}}'_{\text{out}}$ for the guesses of Γ , $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{in}}$, $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{out}}$, and $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{cross}}$ that maximize $\text{area}(\bar{\mathcal{P}}'_{\text{in}} \cup \bar{\mathcal{P}}'_{\text{out}})$. If we guess the (correct) balanced cheap cut due to Lemma 42 in each iteration then our recursion depth is $O(\log_{3/2}(n^2/\delta^2)) = O(\log(n/\delta))$ since the cuts are balanced and each polygon has an area of at least $\Omega(\text{area}(K)\delta^2/n^2)$ (see Lemma 39). Therefore, if in a recursive call of the algorithm the recursion depth is larger than $O(\log(n/\delta))$ then we return the empty set and do not recurse further. Also, if we guess the correct cut in each node of the recursion tree then we cut polygons whose total area is at most a $\frac{\delta}{\log(n/\delta)}$ -fraction of the area of all remaining polygons. Since our recursion depth is $O(\log(n/\delta))$, our algorithm outputs a packing for a set of polygons in \mathcal{P}' with area at least $(1 - \frac{\delta}{\log(n/\delta)})^{O(\log(n/\delta))} \bar{w}(\bar{\mathcal{P}}) = (1 - O(\delta))\text{area}(\bar{\mathcal{P}})$. This implies the following lemma.

Lemma 43. *Assume that there is a non-overlapping packing for \mathcal{P}' in K . There is an algorithm with a running time of $n^{(\Delta \log(n/\delta))^{O(1)}}$ that computes a placement of a set of polygons $\bar{\mathcal{P}}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}'$ inside K such that $\text{area}(\bar{\mathcal{P}}') \geq (1 - O(\delta))\text{area}(\mathcal{P}')$.*

It remains to pack the polygons in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}' := \mathcal{P}' \setminus \bar{\mathcal{P}}'$. The total area of their bounding boxes is bounded by $\sum_{P_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}'} B_i \leq 2\text{area}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}') \leq O(\delta)\text{area}(\mathcal{P}') \leq O(\delta)\text{area}(K)$. Therefore, we can pack them into additional space that we gain via increasing the size of K by a factor $1 + O(\delta)$, using the Next-Fit-Decreasing-Height algorithm [CGJT80].

Theorem 44. *There is an algorithm with a running time of $n^{(\log(n/\delta))^{O(1)}}$ that computes a set \mathcal{P}' with $w(\mathcal{P}') \geq \text{OPT}$ such that \mathcal{P}' fits into K under $(1 + \delta)$ -resource augmentation.*

REFERENCES

- [AW14] Anna Adamaszek and Andreas Wiese. A QPTAS for maximum weight independent set of polygons with polylogarithmically many vertices. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2014)*, pages 645–656. SIAM, 2014.
- [AW15] Anna Adamaszek and Andreas Wiese. A quasi-PTAS for the two-dimensional geometric knapsack problem. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2015)*, pages 1491–1505. SIAM, 2015.
- [BCJ⁺09] Nikhil Bansal, Alberto Caprara, Klaus Jansen, Lars Pradel, and Maxim Sviridenko. A structural lemma in 2-dimensional packing, and its implications on approximability. In *Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC 2009)*, volume 5878 of *LNCS*, pages 77–86. Springer, 2009.
- [CGJT80] Edward G Coffman, Jr, Michael R Garey, David S Johnson, and Robert Endre Tarjan. Performance bounds for level-oriented two-dimensional packing algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 9:808–826, 1980.
- [CK00] Chandra Chekuri and Sanjeev Khanna. A ptas for the multiple knapsack problem. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '00*, pages 213–222, USA, 2000. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [GGH⁺17] Waldo Gálvez, Fabrizio Grandoni, Sandy Heydrich, Salvatore Ingala, Arindam Khan, and Andreas Wiese. Approximating geometric knapsack via l-packings. In *58th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2017, Berkeley, CA, USA, October 15-17, 2017*, pages 260–271, 2017.
- [HW19] Sandy Heydrich and Andreas Wiese. Faster approximation schemes for the two-dimensional knapsack problem. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 15(4):47:1–47:28, 2019.
- [Jin19] Ce Jin. An improved FPTAS for 0-1 knapsack. In *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2019, July 9-12, 2019, Patras, Greece*, pages 76:1–76:14, 2019.
- [JS007] Klaus Jansen and Roberto Solis-Oba. New approximability results for 2-dimensional packing problems. In *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS 2007)*, volume 4708 of *LNCS*, pages 103–114. Springer, 2007.
- [JS008] Klaus Jansen and Roberto Solis-Oba. A polynomial time approximation scheme for the square packing problem. In *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization (IPCO 2008)*, volume 5035 of *LNCS*, pages 184–198. Springer, 2008.
- [JZ04a] Klaus Jansen and Guochuan Zhang. Maximizing the number of packed rectangles. In *Algorithm Theory (SWAT 2004)*, volume 3111 of *LNCS*, pages 362–371. Springer, 2004.
- [JZ04b] Klaus Jansen and Guochuan Zhang. On rectangle packing: maximizing benefits. In *Proceedings of the 15th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2004)*, pages 204–213. SIAM, 2004.
- [LMX18] Carla Negri Lintzmayer, Flávio Keidi Miyazawa, and Eduardo Candido Xavier. Two-dimensional knapsack for circles. In *Latin American Symposium on Theoretical Informatics*, pages 741–754. Springer, 2018.
- [LTW⁺90] Joseph YT Leung, Tommy W Tam, CS Wong, Gilbert H Young, and Francis YL Chin. Packing squares into a square. *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, 10(3):271–275, 1990.
- [Ste97] A Steinberg. A strip-packing algorithm with absolute performance bound 2. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 26(2):401–409, 1997.