

# Manifold Reconstruction using Tangential Delaunay Complexes \*

Jean-Daniel Boissonnat  
Jean-Daniel.Boissonnat@sophia.inria.fr

Arijit Ghosh  
Arijit.Ghosh@sophia.inria.fr

INRIA, Team Geometrica  
2004 route des Lucioles  
06902 Sophia-Antipolis, France

## ABSTRACT

We give a provably correct algorithm to reconstruct a  $k$ -dimensional manifold embedded in  $d$ -dimensional Euclidean space. Input to our algorithm is a point sample coming from an unknown manifold. Our approach is based on two main ideas : the notion of tangential Delaunay complex defined in [6, 19, 20], and the technique of sliver removal by weighting the sample points [13]. Differently from previous methods, we do not construct any subdivision of the embedding  $d$ -dimensional space. As a result, the running time of our algorithm depends only linearly on the extrinsic dimension  $d$  while it depends quadratically on the size of the input sample, and exponentially on the intrinsic dimension  $k$ . To the best of our knowledge, this is the first certified algorithm for manifold reconstruction whose complexity depends linearly on the ambient dimension. We also prove that for a dense enough sample the output of our algorithm is isotopic to the manifold and a close geometric approximation of the manifold.

## Categories and Subject Descriptors

F.2.2 [Nonnumerical Algorithms and problems]: Geometrical problems and computations; I.3.5 [Computational Geometry and Object Modeling]: Curve, surface, solid, and object representations.

## General Terms

Algorithms, Theory.

## Keywords

Tangential Delaunay complex, Weighted Delaunay triangulation, manifold reconstruction, manifold learning, sampling conditions, sliver exudation.

\*This work was partially supported by the ANR project GAIA. For the full version of the paper refer to [7].

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

SCG'10, June 13–16, 2010, Snowbird, Utah, USA.

Copyright 2010 ACM 978-1-4503-0016-2/10/06 ...\$10.00.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Manifold reconstruction consists in computing a PL approximation of an unknown manifold  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  from a finite sample of unorganized points  $\mathcal{P}$  lying on  $M$  or close to  $M$ . When the manifold is a two-dimensional surface embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , the problem is known as the surface reconstruction problem. Surface reconstruction is a problem of major practical interest which has been extensively studied in the fields of Computational Geometry, Computer Graphics and Computer Vision. In the last decade, solid foundations have been established and the problem is now pretty well understood. Refer to Dey's book [17], and the survey by Cazals and Giesen in [10] for recent results. The output of those methods is a triangulated surface that approximates  $M$ . This triangulated surface is usually extracted from a 3-dimensional subdivision of the ambient space (typically a grid or a triangulation). Although rather inoffensive in 3-dimensional space, such data structures depend exponentially on the dimension of the ambient space, and all attempts to extend those geometric approaches to more general manifolds has led to algorithms whose complexities depend exponentially on  $d$  [26, 11, 14].

The problem in higher dimensions is also of great practical interest in data analysis and machine learning. In those fields, the general assumption is that, even if the data are represented as points in a very high dimensional space  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , they in fact live on a manifold of much smaller intrinsic dimension [28]. If the manifold is linear, well-known global techniques like principal component analysis (PCA) or multi-dimensional scaling (MDS) can be efficiently applied. When the manifold is highly nonlinear, several more local techniques have attracted much attention in visual perception and many other areas of science. Among the prominent algorithms are Isomap [30], LLE [27], Laplacian eigenmaps [4], Hessian eigenmaps [18], diffusion maps [24, 25], principal manifolds [31]. Most of those methods reduces to computing an eigendecomposition of some connection matrix. In all cases, the output is a mapping of the original data points into  $\mathbb{R}^k$  where  $k$  is the estimated intrinsic dimension of  $M$ . Those methods come with no or very limited guarantees. For example, Isomap provides a correct embedding only if  $M$  is isometric to a convex open set of  $\mathbb{R}^k$ . To be able to better approximate the sampled manifold, another route is to extend the work on surface reconstruction and to construct a PL approximation of  $M$  from the sample in such a way that, under appropriate sampling conditions, the quality of the approximation can be guaranteed. First investigations along this line can be found in the work of

Cheng, Dey and Ramos [14], and Boissonnat, Guibas and Oudot [8]. In both cases, however, the complexity of the algorithms is exponential in the ambient dimension  $d$ , which highly reduces their practical relevance.

In this paper, we extend the geometric techniques developed in small dimensions and propose a way to avoid computing data structures in the ambient space. We assume that  $\mathbb{M}$  is a smooth manifold of known dimension  $k$  and that we can compute the tangent space to  $\mathbb{M}$  at any sample point. Under those conditions, we propose a provably correct algorithm that allows to construct a simplicial complex of dimension  $k$  that approximates  $\mathbb{M}$ . The complexity of the algorithm is linear in  $d$ , quadratic in the size  $n$  of the sample, and exponential in  $k$ . Our work builds on [14] and [8] but dramatically reduces the dependence on  $d$ . To the best of our knowledge, this is the first certified algorithm for manifold reconstruction whose complexity depends only linearly on the ambient dimension. In the same spirit, Chazal and Oudot [12] have devised an algorithm of intrinsic complexity to solve the easier problem of computing the homology of a manifold from a sample.

Our approach is based on two main ideas : the notion of *tangential Delaunay complex* defined in [20, 6, 19], and the technique of sliver removal by weighting the sample points [13]. The tangential complex is obtained by gluing local (Delaunay) triangulations around each sample point. The tangential complex is a subcomplex of the  $d$ -dimensional Delaunay triangulation of the sample points but it can be computed using mostly operations in the  $k$ -dimensional tangent spaces at the sample points. Hence the dependence on  $k$  rather than  $d$  in the complexity. However, due to the presence of so-called inconsistencies, the local triangulations may not form a triangulated manifold. Although this problem has already been reported [20], no solution was known except for the case of curves ( $k = 1$ ) [19]. We show that we can remove inconsistencies by weighting the sample points under appropriate sample conditions. We can then prove that the approximation returned by our algorithm is isotopic to  $\mathbb{M}$ , and a close geometric approximation of  $\mathbb{M}$ .

Our algorithm can be seen as a *local* version of the cocone algorithm of Cheng et al. [14]. By local, we mean that we do not compute any  $d$ -dimensional data structure like a grid or a triangulation of the ambient space. Still, the tangential complex is a subcomplex of the  $d$ -dimensional Delaunay triangulation of the data points and therefore implicitly relies on a global partition of the ambient space. This is key to our analysis and makes our method depart from other local algorithms that have been proposed in the surface reconstruction literature [16, 23].

**Notations** In the rest of the paper, we assume that  $\mathbb{M}$  is a smooth manifold of dimension  $k$  embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We call  $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  a finite sample of points from  $\mathbb{M}$ . We denote by  $T_p$  the  $k$ -dimensional tangent space at point  $p \in \mathbb{M}$ . We write  $B(c, r)$  for the  $d$ -dimensional ball centered at  $c$  of radius  $r$ . We define the angle between two vector spaces  $U$  and  $V$  as

$$UV = \max_{u \in U} \min_{v \in V} \angle uv. \quad (1)$$

If  $\tau$  is a  $j$ -simplex, the  $(d - j)$ -dimensional normal space of  $\text{aff}(\tau)$  is denoted by  $N_\tau$ .

## 2. DEFINITIONS AND PRELIMINARIES

### 2.1 Weighted Delaunay triangulation

#### 2.1.1 Weighted points

A weighted point is a pair consisting of a point  $p$  of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , called the *center* of the weighted point, and a non-negative real number  $\omega(p)$ , called the *weight* of the weighted point. It might be convenient to visualize the weighted point  $(p, \omega(p))$  as the hypersphere (we will simply say sphere in the sequel) centered at  $p$  of radius  $\omega(p)$ .

Two weighted points (or spheres)  $(p, \omega(p))$  and  $(q, \omega(q))$  are called *orthogonal* when  $\|p - q\|^2 = \omega(p)^2 + \omega(q)^2$ , *further than orthogonal* when  $\|p - q\|^2 > \omega(p)^2 + \omega(q)^2$ , and *closer than orthogonal* when  $\|p - q\|^2 < \omega(p)^2 + \omega(q)^2$ .

Given a point set  $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , a *weight function* on  $\mathcal{P}$  is a non-negative real-valued function  $\omega : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ . Write  $p_i^\omega = (p_i, \omega(p_i))$  and  $\mathcal{P}^\omega = \{p_1^\omega, \dots, p_n^\omega\}$ .

We define the *relative amplitude* of  $\omega$ , denoted as  $\tilde{\omega}$ , as  $\max_{p \in \mathcal{P}, q \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{p\}} \frac{\omega(p)}{\|p - q\|}$ . In the paper, we assume that  $\tilde{\omega} \leq \omega_0 < 1/2$ , for some constant  $\omega_0$  to be fixed later.

Given a subset  $\tau$  of  $d + 1$  weighted points whose centers are affinely independent, there exists a unique sphere orthogonal to the weighted points of  $\tau$ . The sphere is called the *orthosphere* of  $\tau$  and its center and radius are called the *orthocenter* and the *orthoradius* of  $\tau$ . If  $\tau$  is a  $j$ -simplex,  $j < d$ , the orthosphere of  $\tau$  is the smallest sphere that is orthogonal to the (weighted) vertices of  $\tau$ . Plainly, its center  $o_\tau$  lies in  $\text{aff}(\tau)$ . The radius of the orthosphere of  $\tau$  is denoted by  $R'_\tau$ .

A finite set of weighted points  $\mathcal{P}^\omega$  is said to be in *general position* if there exists no sphere orthogonal to  $d + 2$  weighted points of  $\mathcal{P}^\omega$ .

#### 2.1.2 Weighted Voronoi diagram and Delaunay triangulation

Let  $\omega$  be a weight function defined over  $\mathcal{P}$ . We define the weighted Voronoi cell of  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  as


$$\begin{aligned} \text{Vor}^\omega(p) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d & : \|p - x\|^2 - \omega^2(p) \\ & \leq \|q - x\|^2 - \omega^2(q), \forall q \in \mathcal{P}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The weighted Voronoi cells and their  $k$ -dimensional faces,  $0 \leq k \leq d$ , form a cell complex, called the weighted Voronoi diagram of  $\mathcal{P}$ , that decomposes  $\mathbb{R}^d$  into convex polyhedral cells. See [2].

Let  $\tau$  be a subset of points of  $\mathcal{P}$  and write  $\text{Vor}^\omega(\tau) = \bigcap_{x \in \tau} \text{Vor}^\omega(x)$ . If the points of  $\mathcal{P}$  are in general position,  $\text{Vor}^\omega(\tau) = \emptyset$  when  $|\tau| > d + 1$ . The collection of all simplices  $\text{conv}(\tau)$  such that  $\text{Vor}^\omega(\tau) \neq \emptyset$  constitutes the weighted Delaunay triangulation  $\text{Del}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ . The mapping that associates to the face  $\text{Vor}^\omega(\tau)$  of  $\text{Vor}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  the face  $\text{conv}(\tau)$  of  $\text{Del}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  is a *duality*, i.e. a bijection that reverses the inclusion relation.

Alternatively, a  $d$ -simplex  $\tau$  is in  $\text{Del}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  if the orthosphere of  $\tau$  is further than orthogonal from all weighted points in  $\mathcal{P}^\omega \setminus \{\tau^\omega\}$ .

The weighted Delaunay triangulation of a set of weighted points can be computed efficiently in small dimensions and has found many applications, see e.g. [3, 10]. In this paper, we use weighted Delaunay triangulations for two main reasons. The first one is that the restriction of a  $d$ -dimensional weighted Voronoi diagram to an affine space of dimension  $k$  is a  $k$ -dimensional weighted Voronoi diagram that can be computed without computing the  $d$ -dimensional diagram



**Figure 1:** Refer to Lemma 1. The red line denotes the  $k$ -dimensional plane  $H$  and the black line denotes  $\text{Vor}^\omega(p_i p_j)$ .

(see Lemma 1). The other main reason is that some flat simplices named slivers can be removed from a Delaunay triangulation by weighting the vertices (see [14, 8, 13] and Section 4).

**LEMMA 1.** *Let  $H$  be a  $k$ -dimensional affine space of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The restriction of the weighted Voronoi diagram of  $\mathcal{P}$  to  $H$  is the  $k$ -dimensional weighted Voronoi diagram of  $\mathcal{P}'$  where  $\mathcal{P}'$  is the orthogonal projection of  $\mathcal{P}$  onto  $H$  and the squared weight of  $p'_i$  is  $\omega^2(p_i) - \|p_i - p'_i\|^2$ .*

**PROOF.** By Pythagoras theorem, we have  $\forall x \in H \cap \text{Vor}^\omega(p_i)$ ,  $\|x - p_i\|^2 - \omega^2(p_i) \leq \|x - p_j\|^2 - \omega^2(p_j) \Leftrightarrow \|x - p'_i\|^2 + \|p_i - p'_i\|^2 - \omega^2(p_i) \leq \|x - p'_j\|^2 + \|p_j - p'_j\|^2 - \omega^2(p_j)$ , where  $p'_i$  denotes the orthogonal projection of  $p_i \in \mathcal{P}$  onto  $H$ . Hence the restriction of  $\text{Vor}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  to  $H$  is the weighted Voronoi diagram of the weighted points  $(p'_i, \omega_i) \in H$  where  $\omega_i^2 = -\|p_i - p'_i\|^2 + \omega^2(p_i)$ .  $\square$

**LEMMA 2** ([13]). *If  $\tau$  is a simplex of  $\text{Del}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ , then*

1.  $\forall z \in \text{aff}(\text{Vor}^\omega(\tau))$  and  $\forall p, q \in \tau$  we have  $\|q - z\| \leq \frac{\|p - z\|}{\sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2}}$ .
2.  $R_\tau \leq \frac{R'_\tau}{\sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2}}$ .
3.  $\forall z \in \text{aff}(\text{Vor}^\omega(\tau))$  and  $\forall p \in \tau$ ,  $r_z = \sqrt{\|p - z\|^2 - \omega^2(p)} \geq R'_\tau$ .

## 2.2 Sampling conditions

### 2.2.1 Local feature size

The *medial axis* of  $\mathbb{M}$  is the closure of the sets of points of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that have more than one nearest neighbor on  $\mathbb{M}$ . The *local feature size* of  $x \in \mathbb{M}$ ,  $\text{lfs}(x)$ , is the distance of  $x$  to the medial axis of  $\mathbb{M}$ . As is well known and can be easily proved,  $\text{lfs}$  is *Lipschitz continuous* i.e,  $\text{lfs}(x) \leq \text{lfs}(y) + \|x - y\|$ .

### 2.2.2 $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -sample

The point sample  $\mathcal{P}$  is said to be an  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -sample (where  $0 < \delta < \varepsilon < 1$ ) if (1) for any point  $x \in \mathbb{M}$  there exists a point  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  such that  $\|x - p\| \leq \varepsilon \text{lfs}(x)$ , and (2) for any two distinct points  $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $\|p - q\| \geq \delta \text{lfs}(p)$ .<sup>1</sup> The ratio  $\varepsilon/\delta$  is called the *relative density* of  $\mathcal{P}$ .

<sup>1</sup>Observe that the sparsity condition (2) is mandatory if one wants to infer the dimension of  $\mathbb{M}$  from a sample [22].

We will use the following results from [22]. We write  $l_p$  for the distance between  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  and its nearest neighbor in  $\mathcal{P} \setminus \{p\}$ .

**LEMMA 3.** *Given an  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -sample  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $\mathbb{M}$ , we have*

1.  $\delta \text{lfs}(p) \leq l_p \leq \frac{2\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \text{lfs}(p)$ .
2. For any two points  $p, q \in \mathbb{M}$  such that  $\|p - q\| = t \text{lfs}(p)$ ,  $0 < t < 1$ ,  $\sin \angle(pq, T_p) \leq t/2$ .
3. Let  $p$  be a point in  $\mathbb{M}$ . Let  $x$  be a point in  $T_p$  such that  $\|p - x\| \leq t \text{lfs}(p)$  for some  $0 < t \leq 1/4$ . Let  $x'$  be the point on  $\mathbb{M}$  closest to  $x$ . Then  $\|x - x'\| \leq 2t^2 \text{lfs}(p)$ .

## 2.3 Slivers and good simplices

Consider a  $j$ -simplex  $\tau$ , where  $1 \leq j \leq k + 1$ . We denote by  $R_\tau, L_\tau, V_\tau$  and  $\rho(\tau) = R_\tau/L_\tau$  the circumradius, the shortest edge length, the volume, and the radius-edge ratio of  $\tau$  respectively. We further define  $\sigma(\tau) = (V_\tau/L_\tau^j)^{1/j}$ , as the *sliverity measure* of  $\tau$ . The orthocenter of  $\tau$  is denoted by  $o_\tau$  and its orthoradius by  $R'_\tau$ .

If  $p \in \tau$ , we define  $\tau_p = \tau \setminus \{p\}$  to be the  $(j - 1)$ -face of  $\tau$  opposite to  $p$ . We also write  $D_\tau(p)$  for the distance from  $p$  to the affine hull of  $\tau_p$ , and  $H_\tau(p)$  for the *signed distance*<sup>2</sup> from  $o_\tau$  to  $\text{aff}(\tau_p)$ . We state without proof the following easy lemma.

**LEMMA 4.** *Let  $\tau$  be a simplex of  $\text{Del}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  and  $p \in \tau$  s.t.*

1. *There exists  $z \in \text{aff}(\text{Vor}^\omega(\tau))$  s.t.  $\|z - p\| \leq L_1$ .*
2.  $\|p - q\| \leq L_2$  for all vertices  $q$  of  $\tau$ .
3.  $R'_\tau \leq \gamma_0 L_\tau$ .

*Then  $|H_\tau(x)| = \text{dist}(o_\tau, \text{aff}(\tau_x)) \leq L_1 + (1 + \gamma_0 + \omega_0)L_2$  for all vertices  $x$  of  $\tau$ .*

**LEMMA 5** ([13]). *Let  $\tau$  be a simplex of  $\text{Del}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ . Let  $p$  be any vertex of  $\tau$  and write  $H_\tau(\omega(p))$  (instead of  $H_\tau(p)$ ) for the signed distance of  $o_\tau$  to  $\text{aff}(\tau_p)$  parametrized by the weight of  $p$ . We have  $H_\tau(\omega(p)) = H_\tau(0) - \frac{\omega^2(p)}{2D_\tau(p)}$ .*

Slivers are a special type of flat simplices. The property of being a sliver is measured in terms of a parameter  $\sigma_0$ , called the *sliverity bound*, to be fixed later in Section 4.

**DEFINITION 1 (SLIVER).** *Given a positive parameter  $\sigma_0$ , slivers are defined by induction on the dimension : (1) a simplex of dimension less than 3 is not a  $\sigma_0$ -sliver, and (2) for  $j \geq 3$ , a  $j$ -simplex  $\tau$  is a  $\sigma_0$ -sliver if  $\sigma(\tau) < \sigma_0$  and,  $\forall \tau' \subset \tau$ ,  $\sigma(\tau') \geq \sigma_0$ .*

**LEMMA 6.** *If a  $j$ -simplex  $\tau$  is a  $\sigma_0$ -sliver, then  $D_\tau(p) < j\sigma_0 L_\tau$  for all vertices  $p \in \tau$ .*

**PROOF.** The volume of  $\tau$  is


$$V_\tau = \frac{V_{\tau_p} \cdot D_\tau(p)}{j} = \frac{\sigma^{j-1}(\tau_p) L_{\tau_p}^{j-1} \cdot D_\tau(p)}{j}$$

and it is also equal to  $\sigma^j(\tau) L_\tau^j$ . Since  $\tau$  is a  $\sigma_0$ -sliver, we have  $\sigma(\tau) < \sigma_0$  and  $\sigma(\tau_p) \geq \sigma_0$ . Therefore we get

$$D_\tau(p) = j \frac{\sigma^j(\tau)}{\sigma^{j-1}(\tau_p)} \times \frac{L_\tau^j}{L_{\tau_p}^{j-1}} < j\sigma_0 L_\tau.$$

$\square$

<sup>2</sup> $H(p)$  is positive if  $o_\tau \in \text{aff}(\tau)$  and  $p$  lie on the same side of  $\text{aff}(\tau_p)$ , and it is negative if they lie on different sides of  $\text{aff}(\tau_p)$ .



**Figure 2:**  $[pq]$  and  $[pr]$  are edges of the star of  $p$  in  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  since their dual Voronoi edges intersect the tangent space  $T_p$  at  $p$ .

**DEFINITION 2 (GOOD SIMPLEX).** Given two positive constants  $\rho_0$  and  $\sigma_0$ , a simplex  $\tau$  is called a  $(\rho_0, \sigma_0)$ -good simplex if  $\rho(\tau) \leq \rho_0$  and  $\tau$  nor its subsimplices are  $\sigma_0$ -slivers.

The following important lemma is known (see e.g. [14]).

**LEMMA 7 (NORMAL APPROXIMATION).** Let  $\tau$  be a  $(\rho_0, \sigma_0)$ -good  $j$ -simplex for  $j \leq k$  with vertices on a  $k$ -dimensional smooth manifold  $\mathbb{M}$ , and  $p \in \tau$  s.t. the lengths of the edges of  $\tau$  that are incident to  $p$  are less than  $c_3 \varepsilon \text{fls}(p)$  for  $c_3 \varepsilon < 1$ . Then, for any normal vector  $n_p$  of  $\mathbb{M}$  at  $p$ ,  $\tau$  has a normal  $n_\tau$  such that  $\angle n_p n_\tau \leq \alpha_j(\sigma_0) \varepsilon$  where  $\alpha_j(\sigma_0)$  depends on  $j$ ,  $\sigma_0$ ,  $\rho_0$  and  $c_3$ , and  $1/\alpha_j(\sigma_0)$  vanishes with  $\sigma_0$ .

In the sequel, we will simply write  $\alpha(\sigma_0)$  for  $\alpha_k(\sigma_0)$ .


## 2.4 Tangential Delaunay complex and inconsistent configurations

Let  $\text{Del}_{p_i}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  be the weighted Delaunay triangulation of  $\mathcal{P}$  restricted to the tangent space  $T_{p_i}$ . Equivalently, the simplices of  $\text{Del}_{p_i}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  are the simplices of  $\text{Del}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  whose Voronoi dual faces intersect  $T_{p_i}$ , i.e.  $\tau \in \text{Del}_{p_i}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  iff  $\text{Vor}^\omega(\tau) \cap T_{p_i} \neq \emptyset$ . Observe that  $\text{Del}_{p_i}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  is in general a  $k$ -dimensional triangulation. Since this situation can always be ensured by applying some infinitesimal perturbation on  $\mathcal{P}$ , we will assume, in the rest of the paper, that all  $\text{Del}_{p_i}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  are  $k$ -dimensional triangulations. Finally, write  $\text{star}(p_i)$  for the star of  $p_i$  in  $\text{Del}_{p_i}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ , i.e. the set of simplices that are incident to  $p_i$  in  $\text{Del}_{p_i}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ .

We call *tangential Delaunay complex* or *tangential complex* for short, the simplicial complex  $\{\tau, \tau \in \text{star}(p), p \in \mathcal{P}\}$ . We denote it by  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ . By our assumption above,  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  is a  $k$ -dimensional complex contained in  $\text{Del}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ .

By duality, computing  $\text{star}(p_i)$  is equivalent to computing the restriction of the (weighted) Voronoi cell of  $p_i$  to  $T_{p_i}$ , which, by Lemma 1, reduces to computing a cell in a  $k$ -dimensional weighted Voronoi diagram embedded in  $T_{p_i}$ . It follows that the tangential complex can be computed without constructing any data structure of dimension higher than  $k$ , the intrinsic dimension of  $\mathbb{M}$ .

The tangential Delaunay complex is *not* in general a triangulated manifold and therefore not a good approximation of  $\mathbb{M}$ . This is due to the presence of so-called inconsistencies. Consider a  $k$ -simplex  $\tau$  of  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  with two vertices  $p_i$  and  $p_j$  such that  $\tau$  is in  $\text{star}(p_i)$  but not in  $\text{star}(p_j)$  (refer to Fig. 3). We write  $B_i(\tau)$  for the open ball centered on  $T_{p_i}$  that is orthogonal to the (weighted) vertices of  $\tau^\omega$ , and



**Figure 3:** An inconsistent configuration in the unweighted case. Edge  $[p_i p_j]$  is in  $\text{Del}_{p_i}(\mathcal{P})$  but not in  $\text{Del}_{p_j}(\mathcal{P})$  since  $\text{Vor}(p_i p_j)$  intersects  $T_{p_i}$  but not  $T_{p_j}$ . This happens because  $[c_{p_i}, c_{p_j}]$  penetrates (at  $i_\phi$ ) the Voronoi cell of a point  $p_l \neq p_i, p_j$ , therefore creating an inconsistent configuration  $\phi = [p_i, p_j, p_l]$ .

denote by  $c_{p_i}$  and  $r_{p_i}$  its center and its radius. According to our definition,  $\tau$  is inconsistent iff  $B_i(\tau)$  is further than orthogonal from all weighted points in  $\mathcal{P}^\omega \setminus \tau^\omega$  while there exists a weighted point of  $\mathcal{P}^\omega \setminus \tau^\omega$ , say  $p_l^\omega$ , that is closer than orthogonal from  $B_j(\tau)$ . We deduce from the above discussion that the line segment  $[c_{p_i}, c_{p_j}]$  has to penetrate the interior of  $\text{Vor}^\omega(p_l)$ .

We formally define an inconsistent configuration as follows.

**DEFINITION 3 (INCONSISTENT CONFIGURATION).**  $\phi = [p_1, \dots, p_{k+2}]$  is called an inconsistent configuration of  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  witnessed by the triplet  $(p_i, p_j, p_l)$  if

- The  $k$ -simplex  $\tau = \phi \setminus \{p_l\}$  is in  $\text{star}(p_i)$  but not in  $\text{star}(p_j)$ .
- $\tau$  is a  $(\rho_0, \sigma_0)$ -good simplex.
- $\text{Vor}^\omega(p_l)$  is the first cell of  $\text{Vor}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  whose interior is intersected (at a point denoted by  $i_\phi$ ) by the line segment  $[c_{p_i}, c_{p_j}]$  oriented from  $c_{p_i}$  to  $c_{p_j}$ . Here  $c_{p_i} = T_{p_i} \cap \text{Vor}^\omega(\tau)$  and  $c_{p_j} = T_{p_j} \cap \text{aff}(\text{Vor}^\omega(\tau))$ .


Note that  $i_\phi$  is the center of a sphere that is orthogonal to the weighted vertices of  $\tau$  and also to  $p_l^\omega$ , and further than orthogonal from all the other weighted points of  $\mathcal{P}^\omega$ . Equivalently,  $i_\phi$  is the point on  $[c_{p_i}, c_{p_j}]$  that belongs to  $\text{Vor}^\omega(\phi)$ .

An inconsistent configuration is thus a  $(k+1)$ -simplex of  $\text{Del}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ . Such a configuration or its subfaces do not necessarily belong to  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ <sup>3</sup> We write  $\text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  for the subcomplex of  $\text{Del}(\mathcal{P})$  consisting of all the inconsistent configurations of  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  and their subfaces.

## 3. STRUCTURAL RESULTS

In the rest of the paper, we will need several constants :  $\omega_0$ ,  $\rho_0$  and  $\sigma_0$  (to define slivers, good simplices and inconsistent configurations), and  $c_3$  (to be able to use lemma 7).

<sup>3</sup>In fact, as already noted, no  $(k+1)$ -simplex belongs to  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  when the points are in general position.



**Figure 4:** Refer to Lemma 8.  $x'$  is a point on the line segment such that  $\|p - x'\| = c_1 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$ ,  $L = c_1 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$ ,  $\angle pax' = \pi/2$  and  $\angle ptx \geq \angle ptx' > \pi/2$ .

These constants will be fixed in Section 3 and in Section 4. For simplicity, we will write sliver for  $\sigma_0$ -sliver and inconsistent configuration for  $(\rho_0, \sigma_0)$ -inconsistent configuration.

We give now an hypothesis which is assumed to be satisfied in the following results.

**HYPOTHESIS 1.**  $\mathcal{P}$  is an  $(\varepsilon, \delta)$ -sample of  $\mathbb{M}$  of bounded relative density, i.e.  $\varepsilon/\delta \leq \eta_0$  for some positive constant  $\eta_0$ . We assume further that  $\varepsilon$  is small enough and that  $2\alpha(\sigma_0)\varepsilon < 1$ . Finally, we assume that  $\tilde{\omega} \leq \omega_0$  where  $\tilde{\omega}$  is the relative amplitude of the weight assignment  $\omega$  and  $\omega_0$  is a positive constant less than  $1/2$ .

### 3.1 Properties of the tangential Delaunay complex

We now give the following two lemmas which are slight variants of results of [14].

**LEMMA 8.** For all  $x \in T_p \cap \text{Vor}^\omega(p)$ , there exists a positive constant  $c_1$  such that  $\|p - x\| \leq c_1 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$ .

**PROOF.** Assume for a contradiction that there exists a point  $x \in \text{Vor}^\omega(p) \cap T_p$  s.t.  $\|p - x\| > c_1 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$  with  $c_1(1 - c_1 \varepsilon) > 2 + c_1 \varepsilon(1 + c_1 \varepsilon)$  (\*). Let  $q$  be a point on the line segment  $[px]$  such that  $\|p - q\| = c_1 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)/2$ . Let  $q'$  be the point nearest to  $q$  on  $\mathbb{M}$ . From Lemma 3, we have  $\|q - q'\| \leq c_1^2 \varepsilon^2 \text{lfs}(p)/2$ .

Hence,  $\|p - q'\| \leq \|p - q\| + \|q - q'\| < \frac{c_1}{2} \varepsilon(1 + c_1 \varepsilon) \text{lfs}(p)$ . From the 1-Lipschitz property,  $\text{lfs}(q') \leq \text{lfs}(p) + \|p - q'\| < (1 + \frac{c_1}{2} \varepsilon(1 + c_1 \varepsilon)) \text{lfs}(p) < \frac{c_1}{2} (1 - c_1 \varepsilon) \text{lfs}(p)$ , which yields

$$\|p - q'\| \geq \|p - q\| - \|q - q'\| > \frac{c_1}{2} \varepsilon(1 - c_1 \varepsilon) \text{lfs}(p)$$

Since  $\mathcal{P}$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -sample, there exists a point  $t \in \mathcal{P}$ , s.t.  $\|q' - t\| \leq \varepsilon \text{lfs}(q') < \frac{c_1}{2} \varepsilon(1 - c_1 \varepsilon) \text{lfs}(p)$ . We thus have

$$\|q - t\| \leq \|q - q'\| + \|q' - t\| < \frac{c_1}{2} \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p).$$

From Fig. 4, we can see that  $\angle ptx > \pi/2$ . This implies that  $\|x - p\|^2 - \|x - t\|^2 - \|p - t\|^2 > 0$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - p\|^2 &= \|x - t\|^2 - \omega^2(p) + \omega^2(t) \\ &\geq \|p - t\|^2 - \omega^2(p) \\ &\geq \|p - t\|^2 - \omega_0^2 \cdot \|p - t\|^2 \\ &> 0 \quad (\text{as } \omega_0 < \frac{1}{2}) \end{aligned}$$

This implies  $x \notin \text{Vor}^\omega(p)$ , which contradicts our initial assumption. We conclude that  $\text{Vor}^\omega(p) \cap T_p \subseteq B(p, c_1 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p))$  if Inequality (\*) is satisfied, which is true for all  $c_1 = 3 + \sqrt{2} \approx 4.41$  and  $\varepsilon < 0.09$ .  $\square$

**LEMMA 9.** There exists positive constants  $c_2$  and  $\rho'_0$  s.t.

1. If  $pq$  is an edge of  $\text{Del}_{\text{TM}}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ , then  $\|p - q\| \leq c_2 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$ .
2. If  $\tau$  is a simplex of  $\text{Del}_{\text{TM}}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ , then  $R'_\tau \leq \rho'_0 L_\tau$  and  $\rho(\tau) = R_\tau/L_\tau \leq \rho'_0$ .

**PROOF.** 1a. Consider first the case where  $pq$  is an edge of  $\text{Del}_p^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ . Then  $T_p \cap \text{Vor}^\omega(pq) \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $x \in T_p \cap \text{Vor}^\omega(pq)$ . From Lemma 8, we have  $\|p - x\| \leq c_1 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$ . By Lemma 2,  $\|q - x\| \leq \frac{\|p - x\|}{\sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2}} \leq \frac{c_1 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)}{\sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2}}$ . Hence,  $\|p - q\| \leq c'_2 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$

where  $c'_2 = c_1(1 + 1/\sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2}) > 2c_1$ .

1b. From the definition of  $\text{Del}_{\text{TM}}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ , there exists a vertex  $r$  of  $\tau$  such that  $[pq] \in \text{star}(r)$ . From 1a,  $\|r - p\|$  and  $\|r - q\|$  are at most  $c'_2 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(r)$ . From the 1-Lipschitz property of  $\text{lfs}$  and assuming that  $2c'_2 \varepsilon < 1$ , we have  $\text{lfs}(r) \leq \text{lfs}(p) + \|p - r\| \leq \frac{\text{lfs}(p)}{1 - c'_2 \varepsilon} \leq 2 \text{lfs}(p)$ . It follows that  $\|p - q\| \leq \|p - r\| + \|r - q\| \leq 4c'_2 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$ . The first part of the lemma is proved by taking  $c_2 = 4c'_2 > 8c_1$ .

2. Assume that  $\tau \in \text{star}(p)$ . Let  $z \in \text{Vor}^\omega(\tau) \cap T_p$ , and  $r_z = \sqrt{\|z - p\|^2 - \omega^2(p)}$ . By definition, the ball centered at  $z$  with radius  $r_z$  is orthogonal to the weighted vertices of  $\tau$ . From Lemma 2, we have  $r_z \geq R'_\tau$ . Hence it suffices to prove  $r_z \leq \rho'_0 L_\tau$ . Since  $z \in \text{Vor}^\omega(\tau) \cap T_p$ , we deduce from Lemma 8 that  $\|z - p\| \leq c_1 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$ . Therefore

$$r_z = \sqrt{\|z - p\|^2 - \omega^2(p)} \leq \|z - p\| \leq c_1 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p).$$

For any vertex  $q$  of  $\tau$ , we have  $\|p - q\| \leq c_2 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$  (By 1.). Assuming  $2c_2 \varepsilon \leq 1$  and using the fact that  $\text{lfs}$  is 1-Lipschitz,  $\text{lfs}(p) \leq 2 \text{lfs}(q)$ . Therefore, taking for  $q$  a vertex of the shortest edge of  $\tau$ , we have, using Lemma 3,

$$\begin{aligned} r_z &\leq c_1 \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}\right) \delta \text{lfs}(p) \leq c_1 \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}\right) \delta \times 2 \text{lfs}(q) \\ &\leq 2c_1 \eta_0 L_\tau = \rho''_0 L_\tau. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 2, we have  $R_\tau \leq \frac{R'_\tau}{\sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2}}$ . Therefore  $\rho(\tau) \leq \rho'_0 = \frac{\rho''_0}{\sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2}}$ .  $\square$

### 3.2 Properties of inconsistent configurations

We now give the lemmas on inconsistent configurations which are central to the proof of correctness of the reconstruction algorithm given later in the paper.

**LEMMA 10.** Let  $\phi \in \text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  be an inconsistent configuration witnessed by  $(p_i, p_j, p_l)$ . Then, there exists positive constants  $c_3 > c_2$  and  $\rho_0 > \rho'_0$  s.t.

1.  $\|p - i_\phi\| \leq \frac{c_3}{2} \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$  for all vertices  $p$  of  $\phi$ .
2. If  $pq$  is an edge of  $\phi$  then  $\|p - q\| \leq c_3 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$ .
3. If  $\tau$  is a  $j$ -dimensional face of  $\phi$  ( $j \leq k + 1$ ) and  $R'_\tau$  is the orthosphere of  $\tau$ , then  $R'_\tau \leq \rho_0 L_\tau$  and  $R_\tau/L_\tau \leq \rho_0$ .

**PROOF.** From the definition,  $\tau = \phi \setminus \{p_l\}$  belongs to  $\text{Del}_{p_i}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ . We first bound  $\text{dist}(i_\phi, \text{aff}(\tau)) = \|\sigma_\tau - i_\phi\|$  where

$o_\tau$  is the orthocenter of  $\tau$ . By Lemma 8,  $\|p_i - c_{p_i}\| \leq c_1 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p_i)$  and, by Lemma 2, we have

$$\|p_j - c_{p_i}\| \leq \frac{\|p_i - c_{p_i}\|}{\sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2}} \leq \frac{c_1 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p_i)}{\sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2}}$$

Let  $c_3 = c_2 / \sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2} > c_2$ . By Lemma 7,  $\angle(\text{aff}(\tau), T_{p_i}) \leq \alpha(\sigma_0) \varepsilon$ , which implies that  $\sin \angle(\text{aff}(\tau), T_{p_i}) \leq \alpha(\sigma_0) \varepsilon$  and

$$\tan^2 \angle(\text{aff}(\tau), T_{p_i}) \leq \frac{\alpha^2(\sigma_0) \varepsilon^2}{1 - \alpha^2(\sigma_0) \varepsilon^2} < 4 \alpha^2(\sigma_0) \varepsilon^2,$$

since  $2\alpha(\sigma_0) \varepsilon < 1$  (Hypothesis 1). Observing that  $\|p_i - o_\tau\| \leq \|p_i - c_{p_i}\|$ , since  $o_\tau$  belongs to  $\text{aff}(\text{Vor}^\omega(\tau))$  and therefore is the closest point to  $p_i$  in  $\text{aff}(\text{Vor}^\omega(\tau))$ , we deduce

$$\|c_{p_i} - o_\tau\| \leq \|c_{p_i} - p_i\| \sin \angle(\text{aff}(\tau), T_{p_i}) \leq \alpha(\sigma_0) c_1 \varepsilon^2 \text{lfs}(p_i).$$

Moreover,  $\|p_j - o_\tau\| \leq \|p_j - c_{p_i}\|$  as  $o_\tau$  is the closest point to  $p_j$  in  $\text{aff}(\text{Vor}^\omega(\tau))$ . Hence we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \|c_{p_j} - o_\tau\| &\leq \|p_j - o_\tau\| \tan \angle(\text{aff}(\tau), T_{p_j}) \\ &< \frac{2\alpha(\sigma_0) c_1 \varepsilon^2}{\sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2}} \text{lfs}(p_i) \end{aligned}$$

As  $i_\phi \in [c_{p_i} c_{p_j}]$ , we conclude that

$$\|o_\tau - i_\phi\| \leq \frac{2\alpha(\sigma_0) c_1 \varepsilon^2}{\sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2}} \text{lfs}(p_i).$$

1. Assuming that  $2\alpha(\sigma_0) \varepsilon < 1$  and using the facts that  $\|p_i - o_\tau\| \leq \|p_i - i_\phi\|$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|p_i - i_\phi\| &\leq \|p_i - o_\tau\| + \|o_\tau - i_\phi\| \\ &\leq \|p_i - c_{p_i}\| + \|o_\tau - i_\phi\| \\ &\leq \left( c_1 \varepsilon + \frac{2\alpha(\sigma_0) c_1 \varepsilon^2}{\sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2}} \right) \text{lfs}(p_i) \\ &\leq \frac{c_2}{4} \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p_i) \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 2, we have  $\|p - i_\phi\| \leq \frac{\|p_i - i_\phi\|}{\sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2}} = \frac{c_3}{4} \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p_i)$  for all vertices  $p$  of  $\phi$ .

2. Using part 1 of this lemma, we have

$$\|p - q\| \leq \|p - i_\phi\| + \|q - i_\phi\| \leq \frac{c_3}{2} \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p_i)$$

Moreover,  $\text{lfs}(p_i) \leq 2\text{lfs}(p)$  since  $\text{lfs}$  is a 1-Lipschitz function and by taking  $c_3 \varepsilon < 1$ . Hence  $\|p - i_\phi\| \leq \frac{c_3}{2} \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$  and  $\|p - q\| \leq c_3 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$ .

3. Let  $r_\phi = \sqrt{\|i_\phi - p_i\|^2 - \omega^2(p_i)}$ . Since  $i_\phi \in \text{Vor}^\omega(\tau)$ , the ball centered at  $i_\phi$  with radius  $r_\phi$  is orthogonal to the weighted vertices of  $\tau$ . From Lemma 2, we have  $r_\phi \geq R'_\tau$ . Hence it suffices to show that  $r_\phi \leq \rho_0 L_\tau$ . Using  $\|p_i - i_\phi\| \leq \frac{c_3}{4} \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p_i)$  we get

$$r_\phi = \sqrt{\|i_\phi - p_i\|^2 - \omega^2(p_i)} \leq \|i_\phi - p_i\| \leq \frac{c_3}{4} \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p_i).$$

Let  $q$  be a vertex of a shortest edge of  $\tau$ . We have, from part 2 of this lemma,  $\|p_i - q\| \leq c_3 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(q)$ . Therefore

$$R'_\tau \leq r_\phi \leq c_3 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(q) \leq c_3 \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta} \right) \delta \times \text{lfs}(q) \leq c_3 \eta_0 L_\tau$$

From Lemma 2, we have  $R_\tau \leq R'_\tau / \sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2}$ . Therefore,  $R_\tau / L_\tau \leq \rho_0 = c_3 \eta_0 / \sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2}$ .  $\square$

LEMMA 11. Let  $\tau$  be a  $j$ -simplex of  $\text{Del}_{T_M}^\omega(\mathcal{P}) \cup \text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ ,  $j \leq k + 1$ . For any vertex  $p$  of  $\tau$ , there exists a constant  $c_4$  s.t. the distance between the orthocenter  $o(\tau)$  of  $\tau$  and  $\text{aff}(\tau_p)$  is at most  $c_4 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$ .

PROOF. 1. We first consider the case where  $\tau \in \text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ . Then there exists an inconsistent configuration  $\phi$  witnessed by points  $(p_i, p_j, p_l)$  s.t.  $\tau$  is a  $j$ -dimensional subsimplex of  $\phi$ . From Lemma 10, we have  $\|i_\phi - p\| \leq \frac{c_3}{2} \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$ ,  $\|q - p\| \leq c_3 \text{lfs}(p)$  for all  $q \in \phi$  and, since  $\tau \in \text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ ,  $\rho(\tau) \leq \rho_0$ . Using the above facts and Lemma 4, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(o_\tau, \text{aff}(\tau_p)) &\leq \text{dist}(i_\phi, \text{aff}(\tau_p)) \\ &\leq \frac{c_3}{2} \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p) + (1 + \rho_0 + \omega_0) c_3 \text{lfs}(p) \\ &\leq \left( \frac{3}{2} + \rho_0 + \omega_0 \right) c_3 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p) = c_4 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p), \end{aligned}$$

2. Consider now the case where  $\tau \in \text{Del}_{T_M}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ . By definition,  $\tau \in \text{Del}_q^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  for some vertex  $q$  of  $\tau$ . From Lemma 8, we have  $\|q - c_q\| \leq c_1 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(q) \leq 2c_1 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$  where  $c_q = \text{Vor}^\omega(\tau) \cap T_q$  and  $p$  is any vertex of  $\tau$ . The last inequality follows from the facts that  $\text{lfs}$  is 1-Lipschitz,  $\|p - q\| \leq c_2 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$  (Lemma 9) and by taking  $c_2 \varepsilon \leq 1$ . Therefore, using Lemma 4, we get

$$\text{dist}(o_\tau, \text{aff}(\tau_p)) \leq \frac{2c_1 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)}{\sqrt{1 - 4\omega_0^2}} + (1 + \rho'_0 + \omega_0) c_2 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p).$$

$\square$

The next lemma shows that inconsistent configurations are slivers provided that  $\sigma_0$  is sufficiently large wrt  $\varepsilon$ .

LEMMA 12. Let  $\phi$  be an inconsistent configuration and

$$\varepsilon < f(\sigma_0) = \frac{(k+1)\sigma_0}{\rho_0(c_3 + 2\alpha(\sigma_0))}.$$

If the subfaces of  $\phi$  are not slivers, then  $\phi$  is a sliver.

PROOF. Let  $pq$  be the smallest edge of  $\phi$  and let  $r$  be a vertex in  $\phi \setminus \{p, q\}$ . Since  $\phi_r = \phi \setminus \{r\}$  is not a sliver (as all subfaces of  $\phi$  are not slivers) and  $\|r - x\| \leq c_3 \text{lfs}(x)$  (Lemma 10), we have  $\sin \angle(\text{aff}(\phi_r), T_x) \leq \alpha(\sigma_0) \varepsilon$  for all vertices  $x$  of  $\phi_r$  by Lemma 7. From Lemma 3,  $\sin \angle(\text{pr}, T_p) \leq \frac{c_3}{2} \varepsilon$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} D_\phi(r) &= \sin \angle(\text{pr}, \text{aff}(\phi_r)) \times \|p - r\| \\ &\leq (\sin \angle(\text{pr}, T_p) + \sin \angle(\text{aff}(\phi_r), T_p)) \times \|p - r\| \\ &\leq \left( \frac{c_3}{2} + \alpha(\sigma_0) \right) \varepsilon \|p - r\|. \end{aligned}$$

Using the facts that  $\text{vol}(\phi_r) = \sigma^k(\phi_r) L_{\phi_r}^k$ ,  $\sigma(\phi_r) \geq \sigma_0$ ,  $\|p - r\| \leq 2R_\phi$ ,  $\rho(\phi_r) \leq \rho_0$  and  $\varepsilon < f(\sigma_0)$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol}(\phi) &= D_\phi(r) \times \frac{\text{vol}(\phi_r)}{k+1} \\ &\leq \left( \frac{c_3}{2} + \alpha(\sigma_0) \right) \varepsilon \|p - r\| \times \frac{\sigma^k(\phi_r) L_{\phi_r}^k}{k+1} \\ &\leq (c_3 + 2\alpha(\sigma_0)) \varepsilon R_\phi \times \frac{\sigma_0^k L_\phi^k}{k+1} \\ &\leq \frac{\rho_0(c_3 + 2\alpha(\sigma_0)) \varepsilon}{k+1} \times \sigma_0^k L_\phi^{k+1} \\ &< \sigma_0^{k+1} L_\phi^{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

### 3.3 Number of local neighbors

Lemmas 9 and 10 show that, in order to construct  $\text{star}(p)$  and search for inconsistencies involving  $p$ , it is enough to consider the points of  $\mathcal{P}$  that lie in ball  $B_p = B(p, c_3 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p))$ . Since  $\varepsilon$  and  $\text{lfs}(p)$  are not known in practice, we will consider instead the ball  $B'_p = B(p, c_3 \eta_0 l_p)$  where

$$l_x = \min_{q \in \mathcal{P}, q \neq x} \|x - q\|.$$

It is easily seen that  $l_x : \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is 1-Lipschitz and, by Lemma 3, we have  $\delta \text{lfs}(p) \leq l_p \leq \frac{2\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \text{lfs}(p)$ . It follows that  $B'_p$  contains  $B_p$  if  $\varepsilon/\delta \leq \eta_0$ . We call  $LN_p = B'_p \cap \mathcal{P}$  the *local neighborhood* of  $p$ .

LEMMA 13. *The number of points of  $LN_p$  is less than  $N < 2^{O(k)}$ .*

PROOF. For convenience, write  $\nu = 4c_3 \eta_0 \varepsilon$  and assume that  $\nu \leq 1/2$ . We observe that  $LN_p \subset B''_p = B(p, \nu \text{lfs}(p))$  since, by Lemma 3,  $l_p \leq \frac{2\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \text{lfs}(p) \leq 4\varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$ . We will count the number of points in  $B''_p \cap \mathcal{P}$ . Let  $x$  and  $y$  be two points of  $B''_p \cap \mathcal{P}$ . We have  $\text{lfs}(x), \text{lfs}(y) \geq \text{lfs}(p)(1-\nu) \geq \text{lfs}(p)/2$ , since  $\text{lfs}$  is 1-Lipschitz. The balls  $B(x, l_x/2)$  and  $B(y, l_y/2)$  are disjoint, and, since  $l_x \geq \delta \text{lfs}(x) \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \text{lfs}(p)$  (and similarly for  $l_y$ ), the balls  $B_x = B(x, \frac{\delta}{4} \text{lfs}(p))$  and  $B_y = B(y, \frac{\delta}{4} \text{lfs}(p))$  are also disjoint. Observe that both balls  $B_x$  and  $B_y$  are contained in  $B'_p = B(p, \mu \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p))$  where  $\mu = \frac{\nu}{\varepsilon} + \frac{\delta}{4\varepsilon} \leq 4c_3 \eta_0 + \frac{1}{4}$ .

A packing argument now allows to conclude. Specifically, by Lemma 15, we have that  $\text{vol}(B_x \cap \mathbb{M}) > \phi_k \left( \frac{\delta \text{lfs}(p)}{8} \right)^k$  and  $\text{vol}(B'_p \cap \mathbb{M}) < \phi_k (\mu \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p))^k$ , where  $\phi_k$  is the volume of the  $k$ -dimensional unit ball. We conclude that the number of points of  $\mathcal{P} \cap B'_p$  is less than  $\left( \frac{8\mu\varepsilon}{\delta} \right)^k \leq (32c_3 \eta_0 + 2)^k \eta_0^k = 2^{O(k)}$ .  $\square$

## 4. MANIFOLD RECONSTRUCTION

In this section, we will show how to find a weight assignment for the point set  $\mathcal{P}$  so that we can remove all inconsistent configurations. Once this is done, all the stars become coherent and the resulting weighted tangential Delaunay complex is a simplicial  $k$ -manifold.

### 4.1 Algorithm

The input to the algorithm is a point sample  $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$  together with a bound on the relative density  $\eta_0$  of  $\mathcal{P}$ . We assume in addition that the dimension  $k$  of  $\mathbb{M}$  is given and that we know the tangent space  $T_p$  at each point  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ .

The algorithm fixes  $\omega_0$  in  $(0, 1/2)$  and then computes a weight assignment  $\omega \in [0, \omega_0]$  such that no inconsistent configuration remains in the weighted tangential Delaunay complex. More precisely, we will assign a weight to each point  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  in turn so as to remove all  $j$ -dimensional slivers incident to  $p$  in  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P}) \cup \text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  for  $j \in \{3, \dots, k+1\}$ . By Lemma 12, we know that, if  $\sigma_0$  is large enough, removing inconsistent configurations from the tangential Delaunay complex reduces to removing slivers.

For a given  $j$ -simplex  $\tau = [p_0, \dots, p_j] \in \text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P}) \cup \text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^j(\tau) &= \frac{|\det(p_1 - p_0, \dots, p_j - p_0)|}{j! L_\tau^j} \\ &\leq \frac{\prod_{i=1}^j \|p_i - p_0\|}{j! L_\tau^j} \leq \frac{2^j \rho_0^j}{j!} \leq 2\rho_0^j, \end{aligned}$$

the last inequalities follow from the facts that  $L_\tau \leq 2R_\tau$ , and the radius-edge ratio of the simplices in  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P}) \cup \text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  is  $\leq \rho_0$  (Lemmas 9 and 10). This implies that  $\sigma(\tau) \in (0, 2\rho_0]$ . In the first step of our reconstruction algorithm, we pick a random value of  $\sigma_0$  from  $(0, 2\rho_0]$ , and once  $\sigma_0$  is selected, we try to remove all slivers from  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P}) \cup \text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ . If we fail to remove slivers or if we still have inconsistencies, then we go back and select a new value of  $\sigma_0$ .

**Manifold-Reconstruction**( $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ )

```
S0 Calculate  $LN_{p_i} \forall p_i \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $\rho_1$ 
S1 Select  $\sigma_0$  at random from  $(0, 2\rho_1]$ 
S2 for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
    if weight( $p_i, \sigma_0$ ) = "FAIL" then go-to S1
    else update( $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P}), p_i$ )
S3 if  $\text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P}) \neq \emptyset$  then go-to S1
    else output  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ 
```

Before we give the details of the function **weight**() we first define the subroutine **skyline**( $p, S, \sigma_0$ ) that will be used in the function. Let  $S$  be a set of simplices incident on  $p$ .

Let  $\tau$  be a simplex in  $S$  whose subfaces are not  $\sigma_0$ -slivers. Such a simplex is called a *candidate simplex*. We associate to  $\tau$  interval  $W(\tau)$  that consists of all squared weights  $\omega^2(p)$  for which  $\tau$  appears as a simplex in  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P}) \cup \text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ . We define the skyline of  $p$  as the lower boundary of the union of all rectangles  $R(\tau) = W(\tau) \times [\sigma(\tau), +\infty)$  for all candidate simplices over  $W(p) = [0, \omega_0^2 l_p^2]$ , see Figure 5. For any  $\omega^2(p)$ , the minimum sliverity ratio of any *candidate simplex* incident to  $p$  is the height of **skyline**( $p, S_p, \sigma_0$ ) over  $\omega^2(p) \in W(p)$ . The best choice for  $\omega(p)$  is the weight of  $p$  corresponding to the highest point on the **skyline**( $p, S_p, \sigma_0$ ), i.e **skyline**( $p, S_p, \sigma_0$ ) has the maximum height over  $\omega^2(p)$ .

Function **weight**( $p, \sigma_0$ )


```
S1  $S_p \leftarrow \text{detect\_simplices}(p, \sigma_0)$ 
S2 skyline( $p, S_p, \sigma_0$ ) begin
    for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
        if none of the subfaces of  $\tau$  are  $\sigma_0$ -slivers then
            include  $R(\tau) = W(\tau) \times [\sigma(\tau), +\infty)$ 
    end
S3  $\Theta \leftarrow$  highest point on skyline( $p, S_p, \sigma_0$ )
S4 if  $\Theta < \sigma_0$  then return "FAIL"
    else  $\omega(p) \leftarrow$  weight of  $p$  corresponding to a highest
        point on skyline( $p, S_p, \sigma_0$ )
```

Function **update**( $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P}), p$ )

– Update the stars of  $p$  and of all points  $x \in LN_p$  by modifying  $\text{Del}_x^\omega(LN_x)$ .

Function **detect\_simplices**( $p, \sigma_0$ )

1. We first detect all possible  $j$ -simplices for all  $3 \leq j \leq k+1$  of  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  incident on  $p$  for all possible  $\omega(p)$ . This is done in the following way: (1) we vary the weight of  $p$  from 0 to  $\omega_0 l_p$ , keeping the weights of the other points constant; (2) for each new weight assignment to  $p$ , we modify the stars of the points in  $LN_p$  and detect from the stars the new  $j$ -simplices incident



**Figure 5:** The above figure shows a skyline( $p, S_p, \sigma_0$ ) over  $W(p) = [0, \omega^2 l_p^2]$  for point  $p$ .

to  $p$  that have not been detected thus far. The weight of point  $p$  changes only in a finite number of instances  $0 = P_0 < P_1 < \dots < P_{n-1} < P_n = \omega_0 l_p$ .

We determine the next weight assignment of  $p$  in the following way. For each new simplex  $\tau$  currently incident to  $p$ , we keep it in a priority queue ordered by the weight of  $p$  at which  $\tau$  will disappear for the first time. Hence the minimum weight in the priority queue gives the next weight assignment for  $p$ . Since the number of points in  $LN_p$  is bounded, the number of simplices incident to  $p$  is also bounded, as well as the number of times we have to change the weight of  $p$ .

2. Once we have detected all possible  $j$ -simplices, for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$ , that can be incident on  $p$  in the weighted tangential Delaunay complex, we then detect all possible inconsistent configurations incident on  $p$ , by calling the function **detect\_inconsistent\_configuration**( $p, \sigma_0$ ).

Function **detect\_inconsistent\_configurations**( $p, \sigma_0$ )

1. We vary the weight of  $p$  from 0 to  $\omega_0 l_p$ , keeping the weight of the rest of the points constant. Once we have assigned a new weight to  $p$  we modify the stars of the points in  $LN_p$ .
2. Detecting the inconsistent configurations incident to  $p$  is more complicated than detecting the simplices incident to  $p$ . We consider all points  $p_i$  in  $LN_p$ . Let  $\tau$  be a  $k$ -simplex in the star of  $p_i$ , and let  $p_j$  be a vertex of  $\tau$  such that  $\tau$  is not in the star of  $p_j$ . We calculate the Voronoi diagram of the points in  $LN_p$  restricted to the line segment  $[c_{p_i} c_{p_j}]$ , where  $c_{p_i} = T_{p_i} \cap \text{Vor}^\omega(\tau)$  and  $c_{p_j} = T_{p_j} \cap \text{aff}(\text{Vor}^\omega(\tau))$ . From the restricted Voronoi diagram, we find a point  $p$  whose Voronoi cell intersects for the first time the line segment  $[c_{p_i} c_{p_j}]$  oriented from  $c_{p_i}$  to  $c_{p_j}$ . If  $p \in \phi = \tau \cup \{l\}$ , then we report  $\phi$ .
3. As in the **detect\_simplices** function the weight of  $p$  is changed only a finite number of times. For each current inconsistent configuration  $\phi$  incident to  $p$ , we keep in a priority queue the weight of  $p$  for which  $\phi$  will disappear for the first time. The minimum weight in the priority queue gives the next weight assignment of  $p$ .

## 4.2 Analysis of the algorithm

**DEFINITION 4 (SLIVERITY RANGE).** Let  $\omega$  be a weight assignment of relative amplitude at most  $\omega_0$  we keep fixed

except for  $\omega(p)$ . The sliverity range of a point  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  is the measure of the set of all squared weights  $\omega^2(p)$  for which  $p$  is incident to a sliver in  $\text{Del}_{\text{TM}}^\omega(\mathcal{P}) \cup \text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ .

**LEMMA 14.** Under Hypothesis 1, the sliverity range of  $p$  is at most  $\Sigma(p) = N^{k+2}(k+1)c_5 \sigma_0 l_p^2$  for some constant  $c_5$ .

**PROOF.** Let  $\tau$  be a simplex incident on  $p$ . We call the sliverity range of  $\tau$  the measure of the set of squared weights for which  $\tau$  is a sliver in  $\text{Del}_{\text{TM}}^\omega(\mathcal{P}) \cup \text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ . If  $\omega(p)$  is the weight of  $p$ , we write  $H(\omega(p))$  for the signed distance of the orthocenter of  $\tau$  to  $\text{aff}(\tau_p)$ . From Lemma 11, we have  $|H(\omega(p))| \leq c_4 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$ , for all  $\tau \in \text{Del}_{\text{TM}}^\omega(\mathcal{P}) \cup \text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ . Moreover, using Lemma 5 and the fact that  $\tau$  is a sliver,  $H(\omega(p)) = H(0) - \frac{\omega^2(p)}{2D_p} \leq H(0) - \frac{\omega^2(p)}{2j\sigma_0 L_\tau}$ . It follows that the sliverity range of  $\tau$  is at most  $4j\sigma_0 L_\tau c_4 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$ . Using the facts that  $L_\tau \leq c_3 \varepsilon \text{lfs}(p)$  (from Lemmas 9 and 10),  $\text{lfs}(p) \leq l_p/\delta$  and  $\varepsilon/\delta \leq \eta_0$ , the sliverity range of  $\tau$  is less than  $4jc_3c_4\sigma_0\eta_0^2 l_p^2 = jc_5\sigma_0 l_p^2$ . By Lemma 13, the number of  $j$ -simplices that are incident to  $p$  is at most  $N^j$ . Hence, the sliverity range of  $p$  is less than

$$\Sigma(p) = \sum_3^{k+1} N^j jc_5 \sigma_0 l_p^2 \leq N^{k+2}(k+1)c_5 \sigma_0 l_p^2.$$

□

**THEOREM 1.** Under Hypothesis 1 and if

$$\sigma_{\max} = \frac{\omega_0^2}{(k+1)c_5 N^{k+2}} > \sigma_{\min} = \inf\{\sigma \mid \varepsilon < f(\sigma)\},$$

then, for any  $\sigma_0 \in [\sigma_{\min}, \sigma_{\max}]$ , the above algorithm outputs  $\text{Del}_{\text{TM}}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  without any slivers nor inconsistent configuration.

**PROOF.** As in subroutine **skyline**(), let  $S_p$  denotes the set of all possible simplices that can be incident on  $p$  in the complex  $\text{Del}_{\text{TM}}^\omega(\mathcal{P}) \cup \text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  for all possible weight assignments  $\omega$  of relative amplitude  $\tilde{\omega} \leq \omega_0$ . By Lemma 14, the sliverity range of  $p$  is less than  $N^{k+2}(k+1)c_5 \sigma_0 l_p^2$ . If the sliverity range of  $p$  is less than  $\omega_0^2 l_p^2$ , the total range of all possible squared weights, or, equivalently, if

$$\sigma_0 < \sigma_{\max} = \frac{\omega_0^2}{(k+1)c_5 N^{k+2}},$$

then we will be able to remove all slivers incident on  $p$  by selecting the highest point on the skyline.

If we select a value of  $\sigma_0$  in the interval  $(\sigma_{\min}, \sigma_{\max}]$ , Lemma 14 ensures that removing all  $j$ -dimensional slivers for all  $j \in \{3, \dots, k+1\}$  in  $\text{Del}_{\text{TM}}^\omega(\mathcal{P}) \cup \text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$  will also result in removing inconsistent configurations from  $\text{Del}_{\text{TM}}^\omega(\mathcal{P})$ , i.e.  $\text{In}^\omega(\mathcal{P}) = \emptyset$ . □

## 4.3 Time and space complexity

**THEOREM 2.** The time complexity of the algorithm is

$$O(d) |\mathcal{P}|^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda} \times 2^{O(k^2 + \log d)} |\mathcal{P}|,$$

where  $\lambda = (\sigma_{\max} - \sigma_{\min}) / (2\rho_0)$ , and its space complexity is

$$2^{O(k^2 + \log d)} |\mathcal{P}|.$$

**PROOF.** We only sketch the complexity analysis. See [7] for a detailed discussion. Step S0 of **Manifold-Reconstruction** can easily be performed in  $O(d) |\mathcal{P}|^2$  time.

We show now that the expected number of times Step **S1** of **ManifoldReconstruction** is repeated is  $\frac{1}{\lambda}$ . Indeed, for any simplex  $\tau \in \text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P}) \cup \text{In}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P})$ , we have  $\sigma(\tau) \in (0, 2\rho_0]$ . Hence, the probability that, for the selected value of  $\sigma_0$ , the algorithm removes all slivers and inconsistencies is at least  $\lambda = (\sigma_{\max} - \sigma_{\min}) / (2\rho_0)$ . It follows that the expected number of times **S1** is performed is less than

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i(1-\lambda)^{i-1}\lambda = \frac{1}{\lambda}.$$

The time complexities of functions **update**( $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P}), p$ ), **detect\_simplices**( $p, \sigma_0$ ), and **detect\_inconsistent\_configurations**( $p, \sigma_0$ ) are  $2^{O(k(k+\log d))}$ . Indeed, we need to project  $|LN_p| < N < 2^{O(k)}$  points onto  $T_p$ , which costs  $O(kd) \times |LN_p| = O(d)2^{O(k)}$  time. The Delaunay simplices that are computed have their vertices in  $LN_p$  and are of dimension at most  $k+1$ . Hence their number is  $2^{O(k^2)}$ . The basic operations (mainly in-sphere predicates) amount to evaluating signs of determinants of  $k \times k$  matrices. The cost of such a basic operation is  $O(k^3)$ . The total cost of both functions is thus  $O(d)2^{O(k)} + O(k^3)2^{O(k^2)} = 2^{O(k^2+\log d)}$ .

We deduce that the expected time complexity of **ManifoldReconstruction** is

$$O(d)|\mathcal{P}|^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda} \times 2^{O(k^2+\log d)}|\mathcal{P}|.$$

We easily deduce from the above discussion that the total space complexity of the algorithm is

$$2^{O(k^2+\log d)}|\mathcal{P}|. \quad (2)$$

□

#### 4.4 Topological and Geometric guarantees

We assume that the conditions of Theorem 1 are satisfied and denote by  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P})$  the tangential complex output by our algorithm. Let  $\pi$  be the mapping that maps any point of  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P})$  to its closest point on  $\mathbb{M}$ . The proof of topological correctness (see [7]) uses ideas from [1, 8, 11, 14].

**THEOREM 3.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 1, our algorithm outputs  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P})$  without any slivers and inconsistent configurations, and  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P})$  has the following properties*

- **Bijection** : *The restriction of  $\pi$  to  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P})$  is a bijection;*
- **Pointwise approximation** :  $\forall x \in \mathbb{M}, \text{dist}(x, \pi^{-1}(x)) = O(\varepsilon^2 \text{lfs}(x))$ ;
- **Normal approximation** :  $\forall x \in \mathbb{M}, \angle N_x N_{\tau} = O(\varepsilon)$ , where  $\tau$  is a  $k$ -simplex of  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P})$  containing the point  $\pi^{-1}(x)$ ,
- **Topological correctness** :  $\pi$  defines an isotopy between  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P})$  and  $\mathbb{M}$ .

**PROOF SKETCH.** By Lemma 7, one can show that the maximum distance from a point of a simplex  $\tau \in \text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P})$  to the closest point on  $\mathbb{M}$  is  $O(\varepsilon^2 \text{lfs}(x))$ . It follows that the projection  $\pi$  that maps every point of  $\tau$  to its closest point on  $\mathbb{M}$  is injective: if we extend an open segment of length  $\text{lfs}(y)$  from every manifold point  $y$  in all normal directions to  $\mathbb{M}$ , these segments do not intersect, and they can be used

as the fibers of a tubular neighborhood  $\hat{\mathbb{M}}$  of  $\mathbb{M}$ . Each point of such a segment has  $y$  as its unique closest neighbor on  $\mathbb{M}$ . For small enough  $\varepsilon$ , the simplex  $\tau$  is contained in  $\hat{\mathbb{M}}$ . Thus, the mapping  $\pi$  defines an isotopy between  $\tau$  and a corresponding manifold patch.

One can show that two  $k$ -simplices of  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P})$  that share a subface have normal spaces that differ by at most  $O(\varepsilon)$ , and that the mapping  $\pi$  extends continuously across the subfaces. It follows that the projection  $\pi$  restricted to the two adjacent  $k$ -simplices is a homeomorphism that is invertible locally. (In topological terms,  $\pi: \text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P}) \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$  is a covering map, if we can establish that it is surjective.) By assumption, on every component, there is at least one vertex of a simplex of  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P})$ . This ensures that  $\pi(\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P}))$  contains that vertex, and since the mapping can be continued locally, it follows that every component of  $S$  is covered at least once. It is now still possible that some component is covered more than once by  $\pi$ . This would imply that some sample point  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  is covered more than once. However, one can show quite easily that no point  $p$  of  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P})$  except  $p$  itself has  $p$  as its closest neighbor on  $\mathbb{M}$ .

It follows that the mapping  $\pi$  defines an ambient isotopy between  $\text{Del}_{T\mathbb{M}}^{\omega}(\mathcal{P})$  and  $\mathbb{M}$ . □

## 5. CONCLUSION

We have given the first algorithm that is able to reconstruct a smooth manifold in a time that depends only linearly on the dimension of the ambient space. We believe that our algorithm is of practical interest when the dimension of the manifold is small, even if it is embedded in a space of very high dimension. This situation is quite common in practical applications in machine learning.

The algorithm is rather simple. The basic ingredients we need are data structures for constructing weighted Delaunay triangulations in  $k$ -flats. We will report experimental results in a forthcoming paper.

We have assumed that dimension of  $\mathbb{M}$  is known. If not, we can use algorithms given in [22, 15] to estimate the dimension of  $\mathbb{M}$  and the tangent space at each sample point. One interesting feature of our approach is that it is pretty robust and still works if we only have approximate tangent spaces at the sample points.

We have also assumed that we know an upper bound on the relative density  $\eta_0$  of the input sample  $\mathcal{P}$ . Ideas from [21, 8] may be useful to convert a sample to a subsample with a bounded relative density.

We foresee other applications of the tangential complex and of our construction each time computations in the tangent space of a manifold are required, e.g. for dimensionality reduction and approximating the Laplace Beltrami operator [5].

Finally, let us mention that removing inconsistencies among stars that have been computed independently is a useful paradigm that has already been used for maintaining dynamic meshes [29] and generating anisotropic meshes [9]. We hope that this paper will motivate further applications.

## 6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank the anonymous referees for their insightful comments, and Mariette Yvinec for helpful discussions.

## 7. REFERENCES

- [1] N. Amenta, S. Choi, T. K. Dey, , and N. Leekha. A simple algorithm for homeomorphic surface reconstruction. *Intl. Journal of Computational Geometry and Application*, 12:125–141, 2002.
- [2] F. Aurenhammer. Power diagrams: properties, algorithms and applications. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 16(1), 1987.
- [3] F. Aurenhammer and H. Edelsbrunner. An optimal algorithm for constructing the weighted voronoi diagram in the plane. *Pattern Recognition*, 17(2):251–257, 1984.
- [4] M. Belkin and P. Niyogi. Laplacian eigenmaps and spectral techniques for embedding and clustering. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2001.
- [5] M. Belkin, J. Sun, and Y. Wang. Discrete laplace operator on meshed surfaces. In *Proc. ACM Symp. on Computational Geometry*, 2008.
- [6] J.-D. Boissonnat and J. Flötotto. A coordinate system associated with points scattered on a surface. *Computer-Aided Design*, 36:161–174, 2004.
- [7] J.-D. Boissonnat and A. Ghosh. Manifold Reconstruction using Tangential Delaunay Complexes. *INRIA Research Report 7142*, 2009.
- [8] J. D. Boissonnat, L. Guibas, and S. Y. Oudot. Manifold reconstruction in arbitrary dimensions using witness complexes. In *Proc. ACM Symp. on Computational Geometry*, pages 193–204, 2007.
- [9] J.-D. Boissonnat, C. Wormser, and M. Yvinec. Locally uniform anisotropic meshing. In *Proc. ACM Symp. on Computational Geometry*, pages 270–277, 2008.
- [10] F. Cazals and J. Giesen. Delaunay triangulation based surface reconstruction. In J. Boissonnat and M. Teillaud, editors, *Effective Computational Geometry for Curve and Surfaces*. Springer, 2006.
- [11] F. Chazal and A. Lieutier. Smooth Manifold Reconstruction from Noisy and Non uniform Approximation with Guarantees. *Comp. Geom.: Theory and Applications*, 40:156–170, 2008.
- [12] F. Chazal and S. Y. Oudot. Towards Persistence-Based Reconstruction in Euclidean Spaces. In *Proc. ACM Symp. on Computational Geometry*, pages 232–241, 2008.
- [13] S.-W. Cheng, T. K. Dey, H. Edelsbrunner, M. A. Facello, and S.-H. Teng. Sliver Exudation. *Journal of ACM*, 47:883–904, 2000.
- [14] S.-W. Cheng, T. K. Dey, and E. A. Ramos. Manifold Reconstruction from Point Samples. In *Proc. ACM-SIAM Symp. Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1018–1027, 2005.
- [15] S.-W. Cheng, Y. Wang, and Z. Wu. Provable Dimension Detection using Principle Component Analysis. *Intl. Journal of Computational Geometry and Application*, 18(5):415–440, 2008.
- [16] D. Cohen-Steiner and T. K. F. Da. A greedy Delaunay Based Surface Reconstruction Algorithm. *The Visual Computer*, 20:4–16, 2004.
- [17] T. K. Dey. *Curve and Surface Reconstruction: Algorithms with Mathematical Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [18] D. L. Donohu and C. Grimes. Hessian eigenmaps: new locally linear embedding techniques for high dimensional data. *Proceedings of the Natural Academy of Sciences*, 100:5591–5596, 2003.
- [19] J. Flötotto. *A coordinate system associated to a point cloud issued from a manifold: definition, properties and applications*. PhD thesis, Université of Nice Sophia-Antipolis, 2003.
- [20] D. Freedman. Efficient simplicial reconstructions of manifolds from their samples. *IEEE Trans. on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 24(10), 2002.
- [21] S. Funke and E. Ramos. Smooth-surface reconstruction in near-linear time. In *Proc. ACM-SIAM Symp. Discrete Algorithms*, pages 781–780, 2002.
- [22] J. Giesen and U. Wagner. Shape dimension and intrinsic metric from samples of manifolds. In *Proc. ACM Symp. on Computational Geometry*, pages 329–337, 2003.
- [23] M. Gopi, S. Khrisnan, and C. T. Silva. Surface Reconstruction based on Lower Dimensional Localized Delaunay Triangulation. *Eurographics*, 19 (3), 2000.
- [24] S. Lafon and A. B. Lee. Diffusion Maps and Coarse-Graining: A Unified Framework for Dimensionality Reduction, Graph Partitioning, and Data Set Parameterization. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 28:1393–1403, 2006.
- [25] B. Nadler, S. Lafon, R. R. Coifman, and I. G. Kevrekidis. Diffusion maps, spectral clustering and eigenfunctions of fokker-planck operators. *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 18, 2005.
- [26] P. Niyogi, S. Smale, and S. Weinberger. Finding the Homology of Submanifolds with High Confidence from Random Samples. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 39(1-3), March 2008.
- [27] S. T. Roweis and L. K. Saul. Nonlinear dimensionality reduction by locally linear embedding. *Science*, 290:2323–2326, 2000.
- [28] H. S. Seung and D. D. lee. The manifold ways of perception. *Science*, 290:2268–2269, 2000.
- [29] J. Shewchuk. Star splaying: An algorithm for repairing delaunay triangulations and convex hulls. In *Proc. ACM Symp. on Computational Geometry*, pages 237–246, 2005.
- [30] J. B. Tenenbaum, V. deSilva, and J. C. Langford. A global geometric framework for nonlinear dimensionality reduction. *Science*, 290:2319–2323, 2000.
- [31] Z. Zhang and H. Zha. Principal manifolds and nonlinear dimension reduction via local tangent space alignment. *SIAM Journal of Scientific Computing*, 26(1):313–338, 2004.

## APPENDIX

LEMMA 15 ([26]). *Let  $A = B(p, r) \cap \mathbb{M}$  where  $r \leq \epsilon \text{lf}_s(\mathbb{M})$ . Then,  $\phi_k r^k \geq \text{vol}(A) \phi_k r^k / 2^k$ , where  $\phi_k$  is volume of the  $k$ -dimensional unit ball.*