

Rectangular Spiral Galaxies are Still Hard^{1 2}

Erik D. Demaine

*Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

edemaine@mit.edu

Maarten Löffler

Department of Information and Computing Sciences, Universiteit Utrecht

m.loffler@uu.nl

Christiane Schmidt

Communications and Transport Systems, ITN, Linköping University

christiane.schmidt@liu.se

Abstract

Spiral Galaxies is a pencil-and-paper puzzle played on a grid of unit squares: given a set of points called *centers*, the goal is to partition the grid into polyominoes such that each polyomino contains exactly one center and is 180° rotationally symmetric about its center. We show that this puzzle is NP-complete even if the polyominoes are restricted to be (a) rectangles of arbitrary size or (b) 1×1 , 1×3 , and 3×1 rectangles. The proof for the latter variant also implies NP-completeness of finding a non-crossing matching in modified grid graphs where edges connect vertices of distance 2. Moreover, we prove NP-completeness of the design problem of minimizing the number of centers such that there exist a set of Spiral Galaxies that exactly cover a given shape.

1. Introduction

Spiral Galaxies is a pencil-and-paper puzzle published by Nikoli in 2001 [2] under the name “Tentai Show” [3]. It is played on a grid of unit squares with given *centers*: points that are located at grid vertices, square centers, or edge midpoints. The goal is to decompose the grid into polyominoes such that each polyomino contains exactly one center and is 180° rotationally symmetric about its center; see Figure 1 (a). The solution for a Spiral Galaxies puzzle may not be unique, but generally puzzles are designed to have a unique solution.

¹This research was performed in part at the 30th and the 33rd Bellairs Winter Workshop on Computational Geometry. We thank all other participants for a fruitful atmosphere.

²A preliminary extended abstract appeared as a preprint in the Proceedings of the 37th European Workshop on Computational Geometry [1]




Figure 1: Spiral Galaxies puzzles in several styles; solutions in the bottom row. (a) Classic Spiral Galaxies puzzle. (b) Rectangular Galaxies puzzle. (c) Spiral Galaxies puzzle with black and white centers such that the polyominoes containing the black centers in the solution yield a picture.

Friedman [4] showed Spiral Galaxies to be NP-complete for general polyomino shapes, and Fertin et al. [5] showed NP-hardness for Spiral Galaxies of size at most seven. In this paper we consider Rectangular Galaxies, a variant of Spiral Galaxies in which all polyominoes are required to be rectangles; see Figure 1 (b). We consider the general case and a special case in which we allow only 1×1 , 1×3 , and 3×1 rectangles. We show that both puzzle variants are (still) NP-complete. The proof for the latter puzzle also implies that finding a non-crossing matching in squared grid graphs (that is, graphs whose vertices are a subset of the integer lattice and whose edges connect vertices at distance exactly 2) is NP-complete. Moreover, we show that the problem of counting the number of solutions to a Spiral Galaxies board when only 1×1 , 1×3 and 3×1 galaxies are allowed is #P-complete and ASP-complete. Refer to [6, Chapter 28] and [7, 8] for definitions of #P-completeness and ASP-completeness, respectively.

In another variant of the puzzle, a subset of the centers is colored black, and the polyominoes that contain these centers yield a picture as a solution [3]; see Figure 1 (c). Logic puzzles whose solutions yield pictures are a popular genre; one famous example is the nonogram [9]. Such puzzles can also be used to construct fonts [10]. Constructing an interesting puzzle such that its solution is a given target shape is non-trivial: while a valid puzzle trivially exists, by simply placing a center in every grid cell, the resulting puzzle is clearly not interesting. We are thus also interested in finding the minimum number of centers such that there exist galaxies that exactly cover a given shape. We also prove this puzzle design problem to be NP-complete.

1.1. Notation and Preliminaries

The game is played on an $m \times n$ grid. Centers are placed on the grid (on square centers, edge midpoints, or grid vertices), either all of them have the same color, or a subset of the centers may be colored black. To solve each puzzle, the solver is required to partition the board with polyominoes, such that each polyomino contains a single center and is 180° rotationally symmetric about its center. The grid and the centers form a Spiral Galaxies board B .

For our reductions, we use the PLANAR 1-IN-3 SAT problem, a well known NP-complete and #P-complete problem [11]:

Definition 1. *An instance F of the PLANAR 1-IN-3 SAT problem is a Boolean formula in 3-CNF consisting of a set $C = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k\}$ of k clauses over ℓ variables $\mathcal{V} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_\ell\}$. Clauses in F contain variables and negated variables, denoted as literals. A clause is satisfied if and only if it contains exactly one TRUE literal, and the formula F is satisfied if and only if all its clauses are satisfied. The variable-clause incidence graph G is planar and it is sufficient to consider formulae where G has a rectilinear embedding.*

1.2. Organization

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we prove that Spiral Galaxies remains NP-complete when all galaxies are restricted to be rectangles. In Section 3, we show that this is even true when we further restrict the allowed galaxy shapes to rectangles of size 1×1 , 1×3 , and 3×1 . In Section 4, we discuss the relation between the rectangular galaxies puzzle and finding matchings in squared grid graphs. In Section 5 we show that minimizing the number of centers when generating a puzzle with a given output shape is NP-hard. In Section 6, we discuss the possibility of allowing multiple solutions in Spiral Galaxies puzzles, and we investigate a small puzzle related to a Spiral Galaxies font. Finally, we conclude in Section 7.

2. Rectangular Galaxies

In this section, we show that the problem of solving Spiral Galaxies boards is NP-complete when all galaxies are restricted to be rectangles.

We give a reduction from PLANAR 1-IN-3 SAT. Given an instance F of PLANAR 1-IN-3 SAT with incidence graph G , we show how to turn a rectilinear planar embedding of G into a Spiral Galaxies board B such that a solution to B yields a solution to F .

We begin by constructing a representation of variables, we then show how to propagate and bend the variable values using ‘wires’/‘corridors’ and combine the wires to form clauses.

The grid regions not incorporated into our gadgets will not affect the gadget solutions, as for any open region we use a **face gadget**, shown in Figure 2, to force the region to contain single square galaxies, which disallow any other Spiral Galaxies to occupy these grid squares. Therefore, there can be no interference



Figure 2: Face gadget to fill in the space in-between all other gadgets.




Figure 3: (a) Variable loop with two possible states (b) and (c) corresponding to a truth assignment of TRUE and FALSE of the corresponding variable.

between our gadgets and the grid regions surrounding them. Note that our face gadget forces us to not use open regions of width 1, as these would not enforce single square galaxies.

We construct **variable loops** as shown in Figure 3. They are constructed with centers located at edge centers within distance of 3 of each other, the loop is closed by additional centers at edge center points.

Lemma 1. *Each variable loop has exactly two possible solutions.*

PROOF. The variable loops are constructed from two adjacent rows of unit squares, *height-two corridors*; the different rows are connected with columns of unit squares of width one, *width-one corridors*. Because we place face gadgets




Figure 4: U-turn at height-two corridor. If only the topmost unit-square of the leftmost column is assigned to the galaxy centered at the leftmost center of that height-two corridor: contradiction, because the green unit square cannot be assigned to any center. (Shaded unit squares could be assigned to either galaxy.)

in the open regions, no galaxy centered at a center of the variable loop can extend beyond this region of the variable loop. Moreover, centers are located at edge centers. Because galaxies must be 180° rotationally symmetric about their center, each galaxy must at least contain the two unit squares incident to the edge on which its center is located.

Each variable loop includes a U-turn, that is, height-two corridors for which both adjacent width-one corridors are attached to the bottom (or both to the top). These enforce that the galaxies in height-two corridors must end with a vertical edge of length two, see Figure 4. Without loss of generality, we consider a height-two corridor where both width-one corridors connect at the bottom. If the leftmost or rightmost galaxy in the height-two corridor encloses a unit square in the top unit-square row only (red), this enforces the pattern throughout the complete height-two corridor. Without loss of generality, let this be the leftmost galaxy. Thus, the rightmost galaxy cuts off a (set of) unit square(s) in the top row that cannot be caught by any center (green). Consequently, all galaxies in the height-two corridors must be rectangles.

The galaxies with centers in the width-one corridors cannot include any unit squares that are not in the same column of unit squares because both adjacent height-two corridors can be attached to the same side, thus, extending beyond this column would contradict the galaxies being 180° rotationally symmetric about their center. Hence, also all galaxies with centers in the width-one corridors must be rectangles. If the galaxies with centers in the width-one corridors extend beyond the two unit squares incident to the edge on which its center is located, they must contain the complete column.

Thus, we have the following properties:

- All galaxies in the variable loop are rectangles.
- Each galaxy contains the two unit squares incident to the edge on which its center is located.
- Each galaxy with a center in a width-one corridor includes either 2 or 6 unit squares.

Starting with such a galaxy of 2 unit squares around a center in a width-one corridor enforces the galaxy around the first center in each adjacent height-two corridor to have width 5. This again enforces the next galaxy in the corridor to have width 1, and so on. Analogously, starting with any galaxy around a




Figure 5: (a) Variable loops (black centers) and connecting variable corridors (blue centers). (b)/(c) Two possible truth assignments of the connecting corridor depending on the truth assignment in the variable loop. (d) If the corridor does not pick up the correct signal from the variable loop the variable loop cannot be completed.

center in a width-one corridor with 6 unit squares enforces the galaxy around the first center in each adjacent height-two corridor to have width 3. This again enforces the next galaxy in the corridor to have width 3, and so on. Thus, we have exactly two possible solutions for the variable loops. \square

The two possible solutions of the variable loop correspond to setting the variable as TRUE or FALSE, and the rectangle placement is completely determined by the variable assignment.

From each variable loop, we can propagate the variable value, creating a **corridor gadget**, shown in Figure 5. The corridor gadgets are shown in blue and have a center distance of 5 on edge centers. Again, only two truth assignments are possible, each correspond to setting the variable to TRUE (Figure 5(b)) or FALSE (Figure 5(c)). If the corridor does not pick up the correct signal from the variable loop, the variable loop cannot be solved with rectangular Spiral Galaxies, see, e.g., Figure 5(d). We show the **corridor bend** gadget in Figure 6. Moreover, we use a **corridor shift** gadget, shown in Figure 7, which allows us to shift the location of the corridor by any number larger than 3. These are used to connect to the clause gadgets in the appropriate places.

To combine the corridor gadgets into clauses, we use the **clause gadget** shown in Figure 8. At least one of the three variables' truth assignments is forced to be true (see Figure 8(b)–(d)), more than one cannot be set to true (see Figure 8(e)–(h)), hence, it forces exactly 1 true assignment, giving a solution to the instance F .

A solution to an $m \times n$ Spiral Galaxies board can be verified in polynomial time. We conclude:

Theorem 1. *Determining whether a Spiral Galaxies board is solvable with only*




Figure 6: (a) Variable corridors with bend. (b)/(c) Two possible covers with rectangular galaxies.




Figure 7: (a) Variable corridors can be shifted by any number larger than 3 (here shown for a shift of 3 as indicated in green). (b) and (c) depict the different variable assignments.

rectangular galaxies is NP-complete.

3. Spiral Galaxies with 1×1 , 1×3 , and 3×1 Rectangles

In this section, we show that the problem of solving Spiral Galaxies boards is NP-complete, even when only 1×1 , 1×3 and 3×1 galaxies are allowed, and that the problem of counting the number of solutions to a Spiral Galaxies board with these galaxy types is #P-complete and ASP-complete. For our reduction, we again use the PLANAR 1-IN-3 SAT problem. Given an instance F of PLANAR 1-IN-3 SAT with incidence graph G , we show how to turn a rectilinear planar embedding of G into a Spiral Galaxies board B such that a solution to B yields a solution to F , thereby showing NP-completeness. Furthermore, there will be a one-to-one correspondence between solutions of B and solutions of F , showing #P-completeness and ASP-completeness.

In this proof, disks in the figures do not indicate centers for galaxies. Disks with distance 2 can be connected by an edge, and centers will be located at the middle of each potential edge; see Figure 9. Hence, any 1×3 or 3×1 galaxy will cover both disks, denoted by an edge between these two disks; any 1×1 galaxy will not extend over the disks, and is shown by a non-existing edge between the disks.

We start with constructing variable gadgets that represent variables and their negations, we show how we can negate the truth assignment of a variable, and construct clause gadgets in which we combine the variable loops. Throughout the discussion, the constructed gadgets have a single solution for any given variable assignment, which will make this reduction parsimonious.




Figure 8: (a) Clause gadget shown in black and the connecting variable corridors shown in blue. (b)–(d) The clause gadget can be filled in with rectangle galaxies iff exactly one of the three connecting variables has a truth assignment that fulfills the clause. The clause cannot be completed if all variables do not fulfill the clause (e), or if more than one variable fulfills the clause (f)–(h).




Figure 9: We place centers (black circles) on the middle point of potential edges (light gray) between any pair of black disks. In the remainder of this Section, we show only the black disks, but not the centers.

The board region not incorporated into our gadgets will be filled with centers at square centers which will force the region to be filled with unit square galaxies, and will disallow any other type of galaxies. Thus, there is no interference between our gadgets and the board area surrounding them. Again, the face gadget forces us to not use open regions of width 1, as these would not enforce single square galaxies. The **variable loop** is shown in Figure 10.




Figure 10: (a) Variable loop with two possible states (b) and (c) corresponding to a truth assignment of TRUE and FALSE of the corresponding variable.




Figure 11: Negation gadget in blue, with two black variable loops. The incoming loop on the left, has a different truth assignment than the outgoing loop on the right, two cases shown in (a)/(b).

Lemma 2. *Each variable loop has exactly two possible solutions (shown in Figure 10(b) and (c)).*

PROOF. Because of the face gadgets, no galaxy centered at a center of the variable loop can extend beyond the unit squares covered by the potential edges of the variable loop. Hence, horizontal and vertical galaxies have a width and height of 1, respectively. As the centers are placed with distance 2 and galaxies must be 180° rotationally symmetric about their center, horizontal and vertical galaxies have a width and height in $\{1, 3\}$, respectively. Because galaxies may not overlap (we aim to decompose the grid), 1×1 and $1 \times 3 / 3 \times 1$ galaxies must alternate in a possible solution. There exist exactly two possible solutions that fulfill these conditions. \square

Each of the two possible solutions corresponds to one truth assignment for the variable (TRUE and FALSE). We extend the size of the variable loop to connect to other gadgets—to build **corridors**.

Negating a variable corresponds to inserting a **negation gadget** into the corridor, and to continue with another variable corridor as in Figure 11.

We combine the variable corridors into a **clause gadget**, see Figure 12: the variable loops are shown in black, and the clause gadget in gray. There are three possible states of the clause gadget, depicted in red, turquoise, and violet (see Figure 12(b)). Each state forces exactly one of the variables' truth assignments to fulfill the clause assignment (all cases are shown in Figure 12(c)–(e)), giving a solution to the instance F .

A solution to an $m \times n$ Spiral Galaxies board can be verified in polynomial time. We conclude:




Figure 12: (a) Clause gadget, in gray, with the three incoming variable loops, in black. (b) shows the three possible states of the clause gadget, and (c)–(e) give each one assignment in the clause gadget, with the corresponding assignments of the variable loops, the (only) variable with a truth assignments that fulfills the clause is shown in the same color as the clause edges.

Theorem 2. *Determining whether a Spiral Galaxies board is solvable with only 1×1 , 1×3 and 3×1 galaxies is NP-complete and counting the number of solutions is #P-complete and ASP-complete.*

4. Non-Crossing Matching in Squared Grid Graphs

We define a *squared grid graph* as the square of a grid graph. That is, it is a graph $G = (V, E)$ such that $V \subset \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ is a subset of the integer lattice, and $E = \{(v, w) \mid v, w \in V, \|v - w\| = 2\}$ is the set of pairs of vertices at distance exactly 2.

We first observe that squared grid graphs can always be decomposed into two independent components. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a squared grid graph. We decompose $V = V^{\text{even}} \cup V^{\text{odd}}$, where $v = (x, y)$ is in V^{even} when $x + y$ is even, and in V^{odd} when $x + y$ is odd. We observe that there are no edges in G between vertices of V^{even} and V^{odd} . Therefore, in the remainder, we only consider squared grid graphs for which all vertices are *even*.

We say a Spiral Galaxies puzzle is *even* when all *empty* cells are at even positions. We now claim there is a 1-1 correspondence between perfect non-crossing matchings in even squared grid graphs and solutions to even Spiral Galaxies puzzles restricted to 1×1 , 1×3 and 3×1 galaxies.

Lemma 3. *For every even squared grid graph, there exists an equivalent even Spiral Galaxies instance, and vice versa.*

PROOF. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a squared grid graph, such that all vertices are even.

We create an instance of Spiral Galaxies as follows. First, we consider an integer rectangle that contains V as our playing board, and we assume for ease of exposition that the rectangle has its bottom left corner at the origin. Now, for every *even* position (x, y) on the board, we place a galaxy center at (x, y) if and only if the point $(x, y) \notin V$; that is, the vertices of G correspond to empty spots on the board. For every *odd* position (x, y) on the board, we always place a galaxy center.

Similarly, from a given even Spiral Galaxies puzzle, we obtain an even squared grid graph by creating a vertex for every empty grid cell (note that the edges are defined by the vertices).

We now claim that a non-crossing matching in G exists if and only if the Spiral Galaxies instance admits a solution using only 1×1 , 1×3 and 3×1 galaxies. Indeed, all empty cells in the puzzle must be filled, and can only be filled in pairs on opposite sides of a galaxy center, which corresponds exactly with an edge in G . \square

From Lemma 3 and the proof of Theorem 2—interpreting the disks as graph vertices—we may now obtain a corollary:

Corollary 1. *Non-crossing matching in squared grid graphs is NP-complete.*




Figure 13: The local center gadget must have at least one center. (a-d) Different shapes ensure we cannot include them in larger galaxies.

5. Minimizing Centers in Spiral Galaxies for a Given Shape

In this section, we are given a (black) shape \mathcal{S} on a Spiral Galaxies board, and we aim to find the minimum number of centers such that there exist galaxies with these centers that exactly cover the given shape \mathcal{S} . We show that this problem is NP-complete by another reduction from PLANAR 1-IN-3 SAT.

Theorem 3. *Minimizing the number of centers on a Spiral Galaxies board, such that Spiral Galaxies with these centers exactly cover a given shape \mathcal{S} is NP-complete.*

For our reduction, the input is a PLANAR 1-IN-3 SAT formula, and the output is a “picture”: a subset of cells that should be “colored black”. In the remainder of the section, we only focus on the cells that are part of the picture; we will say that the cells which are not part of the picture are *forbidden*.

We will first define some *low-level gadgets*, which each have a constant size. Then, we will build *high-level gadgets*, which consist of multiple low-level gadgets, and which will be used to encode the 3-SAT formula.

5.1. Low-level gadgets

Local center gadgets. First, we introduce *local center gadgets*: thin constructions with unique shapes, which ensure that there must be at least one center in each of them; see Figure 13. The idea will now be to construct a shape which can be covered with exactly this set of centers if and only if the 1-in-3-SAT instance is satisfiable.

Specifically, each local center gadget consists of a single cell with a *desired galaxy center*. Its four direct neighbors are all empty, and its four diagonal neighbors are all forbidden. The cells left and right of the center will serve as connections to other low-level gadgets (we describe the gadgets as if they are vertically oriented; in the actual construction they may be rotated by 90°). The cells above and below the center are extended by symmetrically shaped paths of empty cells which are surrounded by forbidden cells.




Figure 14: (a) The block gadget. (b) A straight block. (c) A corner block. (d) A clause block.




Figure 15: An end gadget has one center, whether or not a block is used by the galaxy next to it.

We can immediately observe that if there is *not* a center at the location of the desired galaxy center in a local center gadget, then either the entire gadget will be part of a larger galaxy with a center outside the gadget, or there must be at least two centers placed inside the gadget. In the first case, because of the symmetry of the galaxies, there must be a second copy of the local center gadget that is also part of the same galaxy. For this reason, we use not one but several different versions of the gadget.

Block gadgets. The second low-level gadget we use is the *block gadget*. A block gadget is simply a 5×5 room surrounded by forbidden cells, except for possibly in the centers of its four sides. The idea is that a block gadget will not contain galaxy centers in an optimal solution, but rather will be connected to local center gadgets and be part of their galaxies. Depending on which of the sides of a block gadget are connected to other gadgets, we distinguish *straight blocks*, *corner blocks*, and *clause blocks*; see Figure 14.

Observation 1. *If we place local center gadgets and block centers in such a way that all local center gadgets that a block gadget is connected to have different shapes, then we must place at least one galaxy center inside each local center gadget.*

End gadgets. Finally, our last low-level gadget is the *end gadget*. An end gadget is similar to a block gadget, but it is a 7×5 room and it has only one connection, at the center of one of its sides of length 5; see Figure 15.




Figure 16: (a) The fix gadget. (b) If the left block is split among multiple galaxies: contradiction.

The idea is that each end gadget will require at least one galaxy center to be placed inside it, but depending on where we place it, more or less of the room is available to be included in neighboring galaxies.

Observation 2. *If an end gadget is connected to a local center gadget, and on the other side of the local center gadget is not another end gadget, then we must place at least one galaxy center inside the end gadget.*

5.2. High-level gadgets

With these low-level gadgets in place, we now turn to constructing high-level gadgets that will encode the variables and clauses of our 1-in-3-SAT instance.

Fix gadgets. First, we define the *fix gadget*: an alternating sequence of four local center gadgets and three block gadgets making a U-turn as in Figure 16. The purpose of this gadget is to ensure that, in an optimal solution, each 5×5 block will be completely included in a single gadget, and not split among several galaxies.

Lemma 4. *In any chain of blocks that contains a fix gadget, each block must completely belong to a single galaxy.*

PROOF. Suppose we have a fix gadget consisting of blocks A , B , and C , where A and C are corner blocks but B is a straight block, and suppose A is split among multiple galaxies, say a red one at the top and a blue one at the right (refer to Figure 16 (b)). Then the bottom center pixel of B must also be red, and hence the top center pixel of C must be red by symmetry. But then C must be completely red; contradiction. \square

Variable gadgets. A *variable chain* consists of alternating local center gadgets and block gadgets starting and ending at *end gadgets*; see Figure 17 for a variable chain. Each variable chain must include at least one fix gadget. Then, by Lemma 4, each block gadget on a variable chain must belong to exactly one of its two neighboring local center gadgets; this choice propagates throughout the entire chain and encodes the value TRUE or FALSE of one of the variables in our 1-in-3-SAT instance. Specifically, we show:

Lemma 5. *Consider a variable chain*

- Which has $k > 1$ local center gadgets and $k - 1$ block gadgets




Figure 17: A variable chain and its two possible truth assignments.

- Which contains at least one fix gadget
- Which has the property that every two consecutive local center gadgets have a different shape

Then there exists no set of $k + 1$ or fewer galaxy centers that form a valid puzzle, and there are exactly two sets of $k + 2$ galaxy centers that form a valid puzzle, both of which include all k desired galaxy centers.

PROOF. By Observation 2 and because $k > 1$, we must place one galaxy center inside each end gadget. By Observation 1 and because we vary the shapes of the local center gadgets, we must place at least one galaxy center at each of the k local center gadgets. So, we need at least $k + 2$ centers. This is also sufficient, as shown by the two solutions with $k + 2$ centers in Figure 17. Finally, by Lemma 4, we cannot have more than two possible shapes for each galaxy. \square

Split gadgets. In order to connect variables to multiple clauses, we need to be able to split them. Rather than splitting chains in the usual sense, our




Figure 18: The split gadget is essentially three end gadgets, but can only be solved with a single center if either all three blocks are used or all three are not used.

split gadget takes three independent variable chains and forces them to have the same state by combining three end gadgets into a single larger end gadget; see Figure 18. This effectively creates a “split” chain with three remaining ends that have the same state; by repeating this we may create as many copies of a variable as required.

The idea behind the split-gadget is simple: by combining three end gadgets into one large 7×15 room, we no longer know that we need three separate galaxy centers; in fact, by Observation 2 we potentially only require to place one galaxy center instead of three. We claim that this is indeed achievable, but *only* when all three chains are in the same state, because otherwise the remaining shape of the room is not 180° -rotation-symmetric.

Observation 3. *A split gadget requires only one galaxy center if and only if either all three adjacent local center gadgets do use a 5×5 area of its room, or if none of them do.*

Clause gadgets. A clause of our 1-in-3-SAT formula is now simply encoded by a single clause block where three variable chains meet: it can be solved without using an additional center if and only if precisely one of the three chains needs to use the block.

5.3. Global construction

With our high-level gadgets now also in place, we can describe the global construction of our reduction.




Figure 19: Puzzle that can be solved for letters A, B, H, R, S, Z (E for disconnected galaxies).

We start by an embedded representation of a PLANAR 1-IN-3 SAT formula, and we locally replace the clauses by a single clause block, the variables by a sufficient number of split gadgets connected by variable chains, and the edges by variable chains connecting variables to clauses.

Note that in this reduction we do not need negation gadgets: by the symmetric nature of galaxies, each chain already contains an alternating sequence of “positive” and “negative” instances of its variable.

Distance considerations. We must make sure that all our gadgets are aligned with the grid, and can be connected to each other. Furthermore, we need to ensure that the number of block gadgets in each variable chain is odd or even depending on the required state of the variable in the respective clause.

We observe that we can achieve all of these requirements by simply adjusting the distance between adjacent block gadgets and allowing a slightly richer class of local center gadgets: instead of a width of 3 we may give them a width of any desired integer w (note that if w is even, we must place a galaxy center on an edge and not in the center of a cell, and we correspondingly also adjust the vertical arms of the gadget by giving them a width of 2 rather than 1).

This concludes the proof of Theorem 3.

6. Multiple Solutions and the Font Puzzle

In Section 5, and in the paper so far, we have studied Spiral Galaxies puzzles under the assumption that it is desirable to create puzzles with a *unique* solution. Now, we briefly explore the possibility of creating a single puzzle with *multiple* solutions, such that each solution forms a different meaningful picture. As a case study, we ask for a single puzzle such that, for every letter of the alphabet, there exists a solution to the puzzle that resembles that letter. In Figure 19, we provide a puzzle which has a solution for the black letters A, B, H, P, R, S, Z (and when we allow for *disconnected* galaxies also for the letter E). See Figure 20 for the solutions.




Figure 20: (a-f) One puzzle with solutions drawing the letters A, B, H, R, S, and Z. (g) When we allow disconnected galaxies, we can also make the letter E. The three dark gray areas together form a single galaxy, and the three light gray areas as well. (h) The puzzle also has many “nonsense” solutions.

While our construction has solutions for several letters, for most letters of the alphabet it does not, and it also has many additional solutions which do not resemble letters at all. We leave as an open problem to construct puzzles which either solve for more letters, or for fewer non-letters, or both. More generally, this raises the question of whether it is possible to create puzzles with multiple solutions in such a way that *every* valid solution forms a meaningful picture.

7. Conclusion and Discussion

We showed that Spiral Galaxies is NP-complete even if the polyominoes are restricted to be rectangles of arbitrary size or 1×1 , 1×3 , and 3×1 rectangles.

With the proof of the latter variant, we also showed that finding a non-crossing matching in grid graphs with edge length 2 is NP-complete. Moreover, we show that the problem of counting the number of solutions for the latter variant is #P-complete and ASP-complete. Finally, we proved NP-completeness of the design problem of finding the minimum number of centers such that there exist galaxies that exactly cover a given shape. The complexity of the latter problem when we aim for unique solutions remains open.

Acknowledgements

C. S. was partially supported by Jubileumsanslaget från Knut och Alice Wallenbergs Stiftelse.

References

- [1] E. Demaine, M. Löffler, C. Schmidt, Rectangular spiral galaxies are still hard, in: 37th European Workshop on Computational Geometry (EuroCG 2021), 2021.
- [2] Nikoli, Tentai Show, URL: http://nikoli.co.jp/en/puzzles/astronomical_show.html.
- [3] G. Puzzles, Spiral Galaxies, URL: <https://www.gmpuzzles.com/blog/spiral-galaxies-rules-info/>, accessed April 4, 2018.
- [4] E. Friedman, Spiral galaxies puzzles are NP-complete, URL: <https://erich-friedman.github.io/papers/spiral.pdf> (Mar. 2002).
- [5] G. Fertin, S. Jamshidi, C. Komusiewicz, Towards an algorithmic guide to Spiral Galaxies, *Theoretical Computer Science* (2015) 26–39.
- [6] V. V. Vazirani, *Approximation Algorithms*, Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2010.
- [7] T. Yato, Complexity and completeness of finding another solution and its application to puzzles (2003).
- [8] T. Yato, T. Seta, Complexity and completeness of finding another solution and its application to puzzles, *IEICE transactions on fundamentals of electronics, communications and computer sciences* 86 (5) (2003) 1052–1060.
- [9] N. Ueda, T. Nagao, NP-completeness results for NONOGRAM via parsimonious reductions, Tech. Rep. TR96-0008, Department of Computer Science, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo, Japan (May 1996).
- [10] W. Anderson, E. D. Demaine, M. L. Demaine, Spiral Galaxies font, *The Mathematics of Various Entertaining Subjects (MOVES 2017)* 3 (2019) 24–30, see also <http://erikdemaine.org/fonts/spiralgalaxies/>.

- [11] M. E. Dyer, A. M. Frieze, Planar 3DM is NP-complete, *Journal of Algorithms* 7 (2) (1986) 174–184.