

# AN ALGORITHM FOR DISCRETE TOMOGRAPHY

L. HAJDU AND R. TIJDEMAN

There are many algorithms in the literature for the approximating reconstruction of a binary matrix from its line sums. In this paper we provide an algorithm which starts from the line sums of an unknown binary matrix  $f$ , and outputs an integer matrix  $S$  with small entries in absolute values such that the line sums of  $f$  and  $S$  coincide. We also give the results of some experiments with the algorithm.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Binary tomography concerns the recovery of binary images from their projections. A binary image is a rectangular array of pixels, each of which is given the value 0 (black) or 1 (white). A projection of a binary image in some direction is defined as the set of line sums for all lines in that direction going through the centers of pixels. Hence it counts how many white pixels are intersected by that line. It is typical for many applications that only a few projections are available (see e.g. [2], [4], [6]). A standard choice for the directions is to consider only row sums, column sums, diagonal sums and anti-diagonal sums. The problem of the recovery of a binary image can be represented by a system of equations which in general is very underdetermined and leads to a large class of solutions. Several authors have made additional assumptions on the location of the white pixels in order to restrict the set of solutions (see e.g. [1], [2], [5], [7] and the references given there.)

The structure of the general solution set has been the subject of a study of the authors [10]. They showed that the solution set of 0–1-solutions is precisely the set of shortest vector solutions in the set of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -solutions. Here the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -solutions are the functions on the rectangular array with the given line sums, where every pixel gets an integral value, not necessarily 0 or 1. It is shown in [10] that the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -solutions form a multidimensional grid on a linear manifold in a linear vector space the dimension of which is the number of pixels considered. Moreover, there is one basic structure, the switching element, the translates of which generate the grid. A simple device is given to derive the switching element from the set of directions.

There are many papers in the literature on algorithms which provide “approximating” results, i.e. which returns 0–1 matrices whose line sums are close, but not necessarily equal to the original ones (see e.g. [8] and [9] and the references given

---

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification:* 92C55 (15A36).

The research of the first author was supported in part by the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Scientific Research (NWO), the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, by the János Bolyai Research Fellowship and by Grants 023800 and T29330 of the Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research.

there). The present paper provides an algorithm for discrete tomography which is based upon the structure analysis. For given line sums it leads to a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -solution with the correct line sums and pixel values (entries of a matrix) which are small in absolute value. Of course, it also yields a 0–1-solution with approximately correct line sums by replacing every positive entry by 1 and every negative entry by 0.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Notation and concepts are introduced in Section 2. The next section contains a description of the algorithm. We start from the orthogonal projection of the origin onto the (minimal) linear real manifold which contains the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -solutions. We use the procedure “Mills” to select an entry and to assign a value to the entry which is meant to be fixed further on. If it is too risky to use the procedure “Mills”, we apply the procedure “Projection” to decrease the absolute values of entries which are rather large, without changing the line sums. After having used procedure “Mills” so often that all entries are fixed, the procedure “Polishing” is applied to check that the constructed solution cannot be improved by a simple application of a translate of the switching element. The algorithm is described in Section 4. Some additional remarks are made in Section 5. We illustrate how our algorithm works on a small example in Section 6. In the final section we report on some numerical experiments with the algorithm.

## 2. NOTATION AND CONCEPTS

Let  $m$  and  $n$  be integers with  $m \geq 4$ ,  $n \geq 4$ . Throughout the paper let  $\mathcal{M}_{m \times n}$  denote the set of matrices of type  $m \times n$ , having real elements. We suppress the subscripts  $m, n$  if their values are obvious.

For  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  the row sums, column sums, diagonal sums and anti-diagonal sums of  $A$  are defined as

$$r_i = \sum_{j=1}^n A(i, j) \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, m,$$

$$s_j = \sum_{i=1}^m A(i, j) \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n,$$

$$t_l = \sum_{i+j=l} A(i, j) \quad \text{for } l = 2, \dots, m+n,$$

$$h_l = \sum_{i-j=l} A(i, j) \quad \text{for } l = 1-n, \dots, m-1,$$

respectively. By a line sum of  $A$  we mean one of the above expressions. By the line sums  $k_l$  ( $l = 1, \dots, 3(m+n) - 2$ ) we mean the line sums in this order.

If  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ , then the inner product of  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  is defined as  $(A_1, A_2) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n A_1(i, j) A_2(i, j)$ , and the length of  $A_1$  as  $|A_1| = \sqrt{(A_1, A_1)}$ , as usual. For  $1 \leq u \leq m-3$ ,  $2 \leq v \leq n-2$  define the *mills* (or switching components)  $m_{u,v} \in \mathcal{M}$  in the following way. Put

$$m_{1,2}(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (i, j) \in \{(1, 2), (2, 4), (3, 1), (4, 3)\}, \\ -1, & \text{if } (i, j) \in \{(1, 3), (2, 1), (3, 4), (4, 2)\}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and for  $1 \leq u \leq m-3, 2 \leq v \leq n-2$  set

$$m_{u,v}(u+i-1, v+j-2) = \begin{cases} m_{1,2}(i, j), & \text{if } m_{1,2}(i, j) \neq 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By this definition we have

$$m_{1,2} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and the other mills are just the translations of the patterns of 1's and -1's.

If  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ , then the inner product value  $(A, m_{u,v})$  will be called the *mill-value* of  $A$  at the mill  $m_{u,v}$ . Let  $q \in \mathbb{R}$ . We say that we *turn* the mill  $m_{u,v}$  by  $q$  in  $A$ , if we add the matrix  $q \cdot m_{u,v}$  to  $A$ . Moreover, we will say that the entry  $(i, j)$  is in the mill  $m_{u,v}$ , or that  $m_{u,v}$  contains  $(i, j)$ , if  $m_{u,v}(i, j) \neq 0$ .

Define the matrix  $F_{m \times n} \in \mathcal{M}$  in the following way. Let  $F_{m \times n}(i, j)$  be the number of the mills containing  $(i, j)$ . Then  $F_{m \times n}$  will be called the *frequency-matrix*. If  $m$  and  $n$  are fixed, then we will abbreviate  $F_{m \times n}$  as  $F$ .

We call  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{M}$  *line-equivalent* if the line sums of  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  coincide. Note that two matrices are line-equivalent if one can be obtained from the other by turning mills. Observe that this relation is an equivalence relation on  $\mathcal{M}$ . The equivalence class of the zero matrix will be called the *switching class*.

Let  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  and let  $a$  be an  $mn$ -tuple. We say that  $A$  and  $a$  correspond to each other, if

$$A(i, j) = a((i-1)n + j) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n.$$

Let  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  and let  $H$  be any set of entries of  $A$ . We will call  $x \in H$  an *extremal element* of  $H$ , if  $|x - 1/2| \geq |y - 1/2|$  for every  $y \in H$ . The element  $x$  is median in  $H$ , if  $|x - 1/2| \leq |y - 1/2|$  for every  $y \in H$ .

Finally, if  $x$  is an element of  $A$ , then write

$$r_1(x) = \begin{cases} x-1, & \text{if } x > 1, \\ x, & \text{if } x < 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$r_2(x) = \begin{cases} 1-x, & \text{if } 1/2 \leq x \leq 1, \\ x, & \text{if } 0 \leq x < 1/2, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We call  $r_1(x)$  the *excess* of  $x$ .

Our algorithm is based on the following result from [10].

**Theorem A.** *Using the above notation, the mills  $m_{u,v}$  ( $1 \leq u \leq m-3, 2 \leq v \leq n-2$ ) form a basis over  $\mathbb{R}$  for the switching class.*

## 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE ALGORITHM

Our starting point is some unknown binary matrix  $f \in \mathcal{M}$ , having the known line sums  $k_l$  ( $l = 1, \dots, 3(m+n) - 2$ ). We would like to recover  $f$  from the line sums  $k_l$ . After a simple filtering procedure, we can get rid of the “margin”, i.e. the constant rows and columns at the side of  $f$ . Indeed, knowing the size and the line sums of  $f$ , we can check whether  $f$  has such a row or column. If  $f$  has such a line, with line sum  $k_i$ , then we delete it from  $f$ . We discard  $k_i$  and modify the other line sums  $k_l$  accordingly: we decrease by 1 those which belongs to a line intersecting the deleted row or column of  $f$ . By the help of the ordered list *peel* we keep track of what has been changed. We also decrease the value of  $m$  or  $n$  according to we deleted a row or a column of  $f$ . Now we take the new  $f$ , and start again the procedure. We repeat this process until the side rows and columns of  $f$  are non-constants. In the rest of this chapter  $f$  will denote the reduced matrix obtained from  $f$  after executing this “peeling” procedure, and  $m \times n$  its size.

We determine a real matrix  $S$  which is line-equivalent to  $f$ , then we make an integer matrix from it by turning mills, hence not leaving the equivalence class of  $f$ . By Theorem A we know that

$$f = S + \sum_{u=1}^{m-3} \sum_{v=2}^{n-2} r_{u,v} m_{u,v}$$

holds with some real coefficients  $r_{u,v}$ . In our algorithm we will “fix” the mills  $m_{u,v}$  one by one. Namely, at a step we choose an appropriate coefficient  $r_{u,v}$  for a mill  $m_{u,v}$ , and then we consider  $m_{u,v}$  to be fixed: we do not use that mill to modify  $S$  any more. After fixing all the mills, the output matrix will be our final solution.

The input of the algorithm consists of the values of  $m$  and  $n$ , the vector  $b$  representing the line sums  $k_l$  of  $f$ , and four parameter values:  $p_1$ ,  $p_2$ ,  $p_3$  and  $p_4$ . The output is a matrix in  $\mathcal{M}$  which is line-equivalent to  $f$ , and has integer coefficients.

In our algorithm we use several sets and matrices. We start with the following settings. Let *fixedmills* =  $\emptyset$ , and put *fixedentries* =  $\{(1, 1), (1, n), (m, 1), (m, n)\}$ . We compute the original frequency-matrix  $F$ . We put the entries  $(i, j)$  for which  $F(i, j) = 1$  holds into the set *border*. We calculate the equivalence class of  $f$ : it is the (linear) manifold  $L$  of real solutions of the linear equation  $B \cdot x = b$ , and determine the shortest vector  $P \in L$ , which is just the orthogonal projection of the origin onto this manifold. (Note that the solution set of a linear equation is always a linear manifold.) It is well-known that the number of operations needed to compute  $P$  is at most cubic in the size of  $B$  (see e.g. [11]), i.e. it is bounded by  $c(mn)^3$  with some numerical positive constant  $c$ . As we work with relatively small size, we do not need high precision. Hence the number  $c(mn)^3$  can also be considered as the (approximate) computational complexity of the determination of  $P$ .

We take  $S \in \mathcal{M}_{m \times n}$  as the matrix corresponding to  $P$ . From now on  $S$  will be the matrix we are working with.

Our algorithm has two main parts, “Mills” and “Projection”. We outline the “Mills” first.

**Mills.**

Starting this part of the algorithm, we choose an extremal element  $x = S(i, j)$  of the set *border*, and an extremal element  $y$  of  $S \setminus \text{fixedentries}$ . We take the unique mill  $m_{u,v}$  which does not belong to the set *fixedmills* and contains the element  $(i, j)$ . Let  $x_0$  be a median element of  $m_{u,v} \cap \text{border}$ . If  $|r_1(y)| + 2r_2(x_0) > p_1$  and we have fixed a mill since switching to “Projection” for the last time, then we go immediately to “Projection”.

Otherwise we turn the mill  $m_{u,v}$  such that the value of  $S(i, j)$  becomes 1 or 0, according to  $x \geq 1/2$  or not. Then we move  $m_{u,v}$  to the set *fixedmills*, modify the frequency-matrix  $F$  by decreasing the value of  $F(i', j')$  by 1 for each  $(i', j')$  belonging to  $m_{u,v}$ , and refresh the set *border*: if the new value of  $F(i', j')$  has become 1, then we put  $(i', j')$  into this set, and if  $F(i', j')$  has become 0, then we move  $(i', j')$  from the set *border* to the set *fixedentries*. In this way we always have

$$\text{border} = \{(i, j) : F(i, j) = 1\}$$

and

$$\text{fixedentries} = \{(i, j) : F(i, j) = 0\}.$$

Now we want to smoothen the new matrix  $S$  near the place where the values of  $S$  changed by the mill turn. By smoothening we mean pushing the elements towards the interval  $[0, 1]$ . We choose an extremal value in the matrix,  $x = S(i, j)$ , say. Let  $z$  be the half of the excess of  $x$ , i.e.  $z = (x - 1)/2$ , if  $x > 1$  and  $z = -x/2$  if  $x < 0$ . (If  $0 \leq x \leq 1$ , then no “local smoothening” is needed, and we simply skip this part of the process.) We distribute the value  $z$  among the mills which contain  $(i, j)$ , in the following way. First we calculate the mill-values of  $S$  at the mills involved, and we turn each mill by  $-1/8$  times its mill-value. Of course, the value of  $S$  at  $(i, j)$  has changed; put  $y = x' - x$ , where  $x'$  is the new value at  $(i, j)$ . If the mills  $m_1, \dots, m_l$  are involved, then we turn  $m_r$  by  $-m_r(i, j)(z + y)/l$  for  $r = 1, \dots, l$ . We repeat this “local smoothening”  $p_2$  times. Then we start again with “Mills”. Of course, if all the mills are fixed, then we are done.

**Projection.**

The “Projection” part of the algorithm is used to smoothen the actual matrix  $S$  “globally”. We proceed as follows. Let *locallyfixed* be the union of the set *fixedentries* and the set of all the entries  $(i, j)$  for which  $|S(i, j) - 1/2| \geq p_3$ . We calculate the set of the solutions of the linear equation  $B \cdot x = b$  which have the already fixed values at the places corresponding to the entries in the set *fixedentries*, and have the values 1 or 0 at the places belonging to the other entries of the set *locallyfixed*, according to  $S(i, j) \geq 1/2$ , or not. If there are no such solutions, then we just switch back to “Mills”. Otherwise for the pairs  $(i, j) \in \text{locallyfixed}$  with  $(i, j) \notin \text{fixedentries}$  put

$$S(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } S(i, j) \geq 1/2, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Having calculated the set of solutions (which is a sub-manifold of the original one), it is easy to calculate the orthogonal projection  $P'$  of the origin onto it. The matrix corresponding to this projection will be the new  $S$ . More precisely, the entries  $(i, j) \in \text{locallyfixed}$  will remain unchanged, and the other entries of  $S$  will be the corresponding entries of  $P'$ . If the extremal element  $z = S(i, j)$  of  $S$  satisfies  $|z - 1/2| > p_4$ , we repeat “Projection”.

### Polishing.

After all the mills have been fixed, the matrix  $S$  has become an integral matrix with small elements, but not necessarily only 0's and 1's. We use "Polishing" to try to obtain an even better approximation of  $f$ . To do this, observe that in case of a binary matrix, every mill-value can be at most 4 in absolute value. Therefore we search for a mill, whose mill-value  $v$  (at  $S$ ) is larger than 4 in absolute value, and turn it by  $\pm \left\lceil \frac{|v|+3}{8} \right\rceil$  in such a way that its new mill-value becomes at most 4 in absolute value. We repeat this procedure as long as we can. After finishing the "Polishing" part, we insert into  $S$  the constant rows and columns deleted in the beginning. We output the matrix obtained as the approximation of the original solution  $f$ .

## 4. THE ALGORITHM

We provide an algorithm, described in the previous section, to construct a solution with small integer entries and exact line sums, if the sums along rows, columns and both diagonals of an unknown 0 – 1 solution are given. The algorithm can be downloaded from the internet page [www.math.leidenuniv.nl/~tengely](http://www.math.leidenuniv.nl/~tengely). We note that it is easy to adjust the algorithm to the case of any finite set of directions. Below we use the notation from Section 2 without any further reference.

### Input

$m^*, n^*$ : the size of the matrix we work with.

The parameter values  $p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4$ .

The vector  $b$  giving the line sums of  $f$ .

### Peeling

P.1 Put  $peel := ()$  and  $m := m^*, n := n^*$ .

P.2 Find the line sums  $b_{i_1}, b_{i_2}, b_{i_3}$  and  $b_{i_4}$  corresponding to the first row, last row, first column and last column of  $f$ , respectively.

P.3 Put  $\max(1) = \max(2) = n$  and  $\max(3) = \max(4) = m$ .

P.4 Choose one of the above  $b_{i_j}$ -s which is minimal or maximal, i.e. for which either  $b_{i_j} = 0$  or  $b_{i_j} = \max(j)$  holds. If there is no such  $b_{i_j}$ , then go to I.1.

P.5 Delete the chosen  $b_{i_j}$  from  $b$ , and append the pair  $(j, b_{i_j})$  to  $peel$ .

P.6 Also delete those two entries of  $b$ , which belong to the diagonal and antidiagonal (one-summand) sums of the corners of  $f$  being on the row or column of  $f$  corresponding to  $b_{i_j}$ .

P.7 If  $b_{i_j} = \max(j)$ , then decrease by 1 the values of all the other entries of  $b$  which belong to a line intersecting the row or column corresponding to  $b_{i_j}$ .

P.8 Put  $m := m - 1$  if  $j \in 1, 2$ , otherwise set  $n := n - 1$ .

P.9 Go to P.2.

*Initialisation*

- I.1 Construct the set  $M = \{m_{u,v} : 1 \leq u \leq m-3, 2 \leq v \leq n-2\}$  of the mills and the matrix  $B$  of the system of linear equations corresponding to the line sums.
- I.2 Put  $fixedmills := \emptyset$  and  $fixedentries := \{(1,1), (1,n), (m,1), (m,n)\}$ .
- I.3 Construct the frequency-matrix  $F$  by  $F(i,j) := |\{(u,v) : m_{u,v}(i,j) \neq 0\}|$ .
- I.4 Set  $border := \{(i,j) : F(i,j) = 1\}$ .
- I.5 Calculate the manifold  $L := \{x : B \cdot x = b\}$ .
- I.6 Compute the orthogonal projection  $P$  of the origin onto  $L$ .
- I.7 Let  $S := (S(i,j))_{\substack{i=1,\dots,m \\ j=1,\dots,n}}$  be the  $m$  by  $n$  matrix corresponding to  $P$ .

*Mills*

- 1.1 If  $|fixedmills| = (m-3)(n-3)$  then go to 3.1.
- 1.2 Find an extremal border element  $x = S(i',j')$  and find the unique mill  $\tilde{m}$  containing  $(i',j')$ .
- 1.3 Find an extremal value  $y$  of  $S \setminus fixedentries$ .
- 1.4 Choose a median element  $x_0$  of  $\tilde{m} \cap border$ .
- 1.5 If  $|r_1(y)| + 2r_2(x_0) > p_1$  and we have fixed a mill since the last “Projection”, then go to 2.1.
- 1.6 Let  $t := 1 - x$  if  $x \geq 1/2$ , and  $t := -x$  otherwise.
- 1.7 Put  $S := S + (t\tilde{m}(i',j')) \cdot \tilde{m}$ .
- 1.8 Put the mill  $\tilde{m}$  into the set  $fixedmills$ .
- 1.9 Modify the frequency-matrix: for every  $(i,j)$  with  $\tilde{m}(i,j) \neq 0$  decrease  $F(i,j)$  by 1.
- 1.10 For every entry  $(i,j)$ , if  $F(i,j)$  has become 0 then move  $(i,j)$  from  $border$  to  $fixedentries$ , and if  $F(i,j)$  has become 1 then put  $(i,j)$  into  $border$ .
- 1.11 Set  $counter := 0$ .
- 1.12 Find an extremal value  $x = S(i',j')$  of  $S \setminus fixedentries$ .
- 1.13 If  $0 \leq x \leq 1$ , then go to 1.1.
- 1.14 Put  $z := r_1(x)/2$ .
- 1.15 Determine the set  $\{m_1, \dots, m_l\}$  of the mills which are not in  $fixedmills$  and contain  $(i',j')$ .
- 1.16 For  $r = 1, \dots, l$  compute the mill-value  $v_r := \sum_{(i,j) \in A} S(i,j)m_r(i,j)$ .
- 1.17 Set  $y := -\frac{1}{8} \sum_{r=1}^l v_r m_r(i',j')$ .
- 1.18 Set  $S := S - \frac{1}{8} \sum_{r=1}^l v_r m_r - \frac{1}{l}(z+y) \sum_{r=1}^l m_r(i',j') \cdot m_r$ .
- 1.19 Increase the value of  $counter$  by 1.
- 1.20 If  $counter = p_2$ , then go to 1.1, otherwise go to 1.12.

### Projection

- 2.1 Set *locallyfixed* := *fixedentries*.
- 2.2 Put  $B' := B$  and  $b' := b$ .
- 2.3 Put all the entries with  $|S(i', j') - 1/2| \geq p_3$  into *locallyfixed*.
- 2.4 Delete all the columns of  $B'$  corresponding to the entries in *locallyfixed*.
- 2.5 For every  $(i, j) \in \text{locallyfixed}$  with  $S(i, j) \geq 1/2$ , decrease the value of the corresponding four entries of  $b'$  by one.
- 2.6 Calculate the manifold  $L' := \{x' : B' \cdot x' = b'\}$ .
- 2.7 If  $L'$  is empty, then go to 1.1.
- 2.8 Let  $P'$  be the projection of the origin onto  $L'$ .
- 2.9 For every  $(i, j)$ , if  $(i, j) \in \text{locallyfixed} \setminus \text{fixedentries}$  put

$$S(i, j) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } S(i, j) \geq 1/2, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

else, if  $(i, j) \notin \text{fixedentries}$  then let  $S(i, j)$  be the corresponding entry of  $P'$ .

- 2.10 Calculate an extremal element  $x$  of  $S$  among the elements of  $S$  which do not belong to *locallyfixed*.
- 2.11 If  $|x - 1/2| \leq p_4$  then go to 1.1, otherwise go to 2.3.

### Polishing

- 3.1 Search for a mill  $\tilde{m}$  whose mill-value  $v_{\tilde{m}}$  of  $S$  is larger than 4 in absolute value.
- 3.2 If there are no such  $\tilde{m}$ , then go to 4.1.
- 3.3 Put  $S := S - \text{sign}(v_{\tilde{m}}) \left\lceil \frac{|v_{\tilde{m}}| + 3}{8} \right\rceil \cdot \tilde{m}$ .
- 3.4 Go to 3.1.

### Output

- 4.1 By the help of the ordered list *peel*, successively append to the sides of  $S$  the appropriate constant rows and columns.
- 4.2 Output the matrix obtained.

## 5. SOME REMARKS

We give a few remarks on the technical details of the above algorithm.

By the help of the “Peeling” part of the algorithm we can get rid of the constant side lines of the original matrix  $f$ . The motivation of it is that this “margin” of  $f$  can be rather large if the matrix  $f$  corresponds to a binary image. In this way our algorithm becomes independent of this “margin”.

About the mill-fixing part of the algorithm we would like to note that, as one could see, we restricted ourselves to the “border” of  $S$ . The reason is that if more mills are involved it is hard to guess what is the right distribution of mill turns. We also mention that the inequality

$$|r_1(y)| + 2r_2(x_0) > p_1$$



which is used at point 1.5 of the algorithm to determine whether it is necessary to switch to “Projection” or not, can be considered as a “parameter” as well. We chose this inequality because of its simplicity. The coefficients reflect our impression that the coefficient corresponding to the border element better be larger than the one corresponding with  $y$ .

By the local smoothening the extremal values  $S(i, j)$  become less extreme at the cost of neighbouring values. Sometimes the more time-consuming Projection part can so be delayed. If many mills are fixed, the local smoothening loses its effectiveness.

About the projecting part we just mention that as we know that the original equation has a 0 – 1-solution, it is not surprising that after a few steps (if we were careful enough with the choice of our parameters) we can expect to obtain a “smooth” solution, and we can return to the “Mills” part of the process.

It is important to note that the whole procedure is finite. Indeed, “Mills” is used exactly  $(m - 3)(n - 3)$  times: if all the mills are fixed, then we start “Polishing”. (Here  $m, n$  are the numbers obtained from  $m^*, n^*$  after executing the “Peeling” part.) In fact steps 1.1-1.10 are repeated  $(m - 3)(n - 3)$  times, while steps 1.11-1.20 are executed  $p_2(m - 3)(n - 3)$  times altogether. At every execution, “Projection” also terminates, as the dimensions of the solution manifolds calculated here are strictly decreasing, provided that  $p_3 \leq p_4$ . (So it is worth to choose these parameters to satisfy this inequality.) More precisely, steps 2.1 and 2.2 are repeated at most  $(m - 3)(n - 3)$  times. As the maximal number of columns of the matrix  $B'$  in 2.2 is  $mn$ , steps 2.3-2.10 are executed at most  $(m - 3)(n - 3)mn$  times during the whole process. Finally, it is easy to see that “Polishing” also provides a finite sub-procedure. Following the proof of Theorem 2 of [10] it is possible to derive a polynomial upper bound for the absolute values of the entries of the matrix  $S$  calculated at step I.7 of the algorithm. Hence one could give an explicit polynomial upper bound in terms of  $m$  and  $n$  (and of the parameter values  $p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4$ ) for the number of executions of the steps of “Polishing”, too. However, as this sub-procedure is the less important part of the algorithm, we do not work out the details. Summarizing, the whole procedure stops after finitely many steps, and one can derive an upper bound depending only on  $m, n$  and the parameters  $p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4$  for the number of these steps. The computational complexity of each step is also polynomial (see the fourth paragraph of Section 3 for the most crucial part). Thus one could derive an effective upper bound for the computational complexity of the whole algorithm, in terms of  $m, n$  and the parameter values  $p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4$ .

## 6. ILLUSTRATION OF THE METHOD

To illustrate how our algorithm works, we present a simple example of size  $8 \times 7$ . Let the input be  $(p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4) = (0.6, 1, 0.5, 0.5)$  and the 43-tuple  $b$  consisting of the 8 row sums, 7 column sums, 14 diagonal sums and 14 antidiagonal sums of the matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$



$$F = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 3 & 4 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ 2 & 3 & 4 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad S = \begin{pmatrix} 1.00 & 0.33 & 0.25 & -0.08 & -0.50 & 0.00 \\ 0.67 & 0.65 & 0.40 & 0.52 & 0.27 & 0.50 \\ 0.10 & 0.54 & 0.48 & 0.60 & 0.46 & 0.81 \\ 0.15 & 0.42 & 0.98 & 0.94 & 0.75 & 0.77 \\ 0.08 & 0.15 & 0.19 & 0.73 & -0.06 & -0.08 \\ 1.00 & 0.92 & 0.71 & 0.29 & 0.08 & 0.00 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the entries of  $S$  are calculated with two digit accuracy. At this stage we clearly have

$$fixedentries = \{(1, 1), (1, 6), (6, 1), (6, 6)\}$$

and

$$border = \{(1, 2), (1, 5), (2, 1), (2, 6), (5, 1), (5, 6), (6, 2), (6, 5)\}.$$

Starting the ‘‘Mills’’ part of the algorithm, we find that  $x := S(1, 5) = -0.50$  is an extremal border element, and  $\tilde{m} := m_{1,4}$  is the unique mill containing  $(1, 5)$ . In steps 1.3 and 1.4 of the algorithm we obtain

$$y := -0.50 \quad \text{and} \quad x_0 := 0.50,$$

whence

$$|r_1(y)| + 2r_2(x_0) = 0.50 + 2 \cdot 0.50 = 1.50 > 0.60 = p_1.$$

Since we have not applied 1.8 yet, we nevertheless continue ‘‘Mills’’ and turn the mill  $\tilde{m}$  by the coefficient  $-0.50$ . We get

$$S := S - 0.50 \cdot \tilde{m} = \begin{pmatrix} 1.00 & 0.33 & 0.25 & -0.58 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\ 0.67 & 0.65 & 0.90 & 0.52 & 0.27 & 0.00 \\ 0.10 & 0.54 & -0.02 & 0.60 & 0.46 & 1.31 \\ 0.15 & 0.42 & 0.98 & 1.44 & 0.25 & 0.77 \\ 0.08 & 0.15 & 0.19 & 0.73 & -0.06 & -0.08 \\ 1.00 & 0.92 & 0.71 & 0.29 & 0.08 & 0.00 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$fixedmills := \{(1, 4)\}, \quad fixedentries := \{(1, 1), (1, 5), (1, 6), (2, 6), (6, 1), (6, 6)\}$$

and

$$border := \{(1, 2), (1, 4), (2, 1), (3, 6), (5, 1), (5, 6), (6, 2), (6, 5)\}.$$

For the extremal value  $x$  defined in step 1.12 we get  $x := S(1, 4) = -0.58$ , whence  $z := -0.29$ . The only non-fixed mill containing  $(1, 4)$  is  $m_1 := m_{1,3}$ . The mill value of  $m_1$  is

$$v_1 := 0.25 + 0.58 + 0.27 - 0.46 + 1.44 - 0.98 + 0.54 - 0.65 = 0.99,$$

which yields  $y := 0.12$ . Hence in step 1.18 we get

$$S := S - 0.12 \cdot m_1 - 0.17 \cdot m_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1.00 & 0.33 & -0.04 & -0.29 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\ 0.67 & 0.94 & 0.90 & 0.52 & -0.02 & 0.00 \\ 0.10 & 0.25 & -0.02 & 0.60 & 0.75 & 1.31 \\ 0.15 & 0.42 & 1.27 & 1.15 & 0.25 & 0.77 \\ 0.08 & 0.15 & 0.19 & 0.73 & -0.06 & -0.08 \\ 1.00 & 0.92 & 0.71 & 0.29 & 0.08 & 0.00 \end{pmatrix}$$

and we return to step 1.1. Now we find that  $x := S(5, 3) = 1.31$  is an extremal border element, and  $\tilde{m} := m_{2,4}$  is the unique mill containing  $(5, 3)$ . After a similar calculation as above, we obtain

$$S := S - 0.31 \cdot \tilde{m} = \begin{pmatrix} 1.00 & 0.33 & -0.04 & -0.29 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\ 0.67 & 0.94 & 0.90 & 0.21 & 0.29 & 0.00 \\ 0.10 & 0.25 & 0.29 & 0.60 & 0.75 & 1.00 \\ 0.15 & 0.42 & 0.96 & 1.15 & 0.25 & 1.08 \\ 0.08 & 0.15 & 0.19 & 1.04 & -0.37 & -0.08 \\ 1.00 & 0.92 & 0.71 & 0.29 & 0.08 & 0.00 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$fixedmills := \{(1, 4), (2, 4)\},$$

$$fixedentries := \{(1, 1), (1, 5), (1, 6), (2, 6), (3, 6), (6, 1), (6, 6)\}$$

and

$$border := \{(1, 2), (1, 4), (2, 1), (2, 5), (4, 6), (5, 1), (5, 5), (5, 6), (6, 2), (6, 5)\}.$$

For the extremal value  $x$  in step 1.12 we now get  $x := S(5, 5) = -0.37$ , whence  $z := -0.19$ . Executing a smoothening step as above, we get

$$S := S + 0.05 \cdot m_1 - 0.24m_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1.00 & 0.33 & -0.04 & -0.29 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\ 0.67 & 0.94 & 0.90 & 0.21 & 0.29 & 0.00 \\ 0.10 & 0.25 & 0.10 & 0.79 & 0.75 & 1.00 \\ 0.15 & 0.61 & 0.96 & 1.15 & 0.06 & 1.08 \\ 0.08 & -0.04 & 0.19 & 1.04 & -0.18 & -0.08 \\ 1.00 & 0.92 & 0.90 & 0.10 & 0.08 & 0.00 \end{pmatrix}$$

and we go to step 1.1. Now we find that  $x := S(1, 4) = -0.29$  is an extremal border element, and  $\tilde{m} := m_{1,3}$  is the unique mill containing  $(1, 4)$ . In steps 1.3 and 1.4 of the algorithm we find

$$y := -0.29 \quad \text{and} \quad x_0 := 0.29,$$

whence

$$|r_1(y)| + 2r_2(x_0) = 0.29 + 2 \cdot 0.29 = 0.87 > 0.60 = p_1.$$

We switch to “Projection”. As  $p_3 = 0.5$ , we replace the negative elements of  $S$  by 0 and the elements exceeding 1 by 1. We obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & x_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x_2 & x_3 & x_4 & x_5 & x_6 & 0 \\ x_7 & x_8 & x_9 & x_{10} & x_{11} & 1 \\ x_{12} & x_{13} & x_{14} & 1 & x_{15} & 1 \\ x_{16} & 0 & x_{17} & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & x_{18} & x_{19} & x_{20} & x_{21} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the symbols  $x_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq 21$ ) stand for the elements of  $S$  which are inside  $(0, 1)$ . Let  $B'$  be the matrix of type  $34 \times 21$  obtained from  $B$  by deleting the 15 columns of  $B$  corresponding to the 0-s and 1-s in the previous matrix. The corresponding vector  $b'$  is given by

$$b'^T = (0 \ 3 \ 2 \ 2 \ 1 \ 2 \ 1 \ 3 \ 3 \ 2 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 2 \ 2 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 2 \ 1 \ 3 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0),$$

where  $b'^T$  is the transpose of  $b'$ . It turns out that equation  $B' \cdot x' = b'$  has a unique solution. Replacing the corresponding entries of this solution to the previous matrix we obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Choosing this matrix as  $S$ , and going back to “Mills”, we just fix all the non-fixed mills one by one, without changing the values of the previous matrix. (The mill which is being fixed, is turned with the coefficient 0.) Finally, we have to “put

back” those rows and columns into this  $S$ , which were deleted in the beginning. So in the present example the output will be

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that even in this simple case rounding of the entries of the initial matrix  $S$  does not yield  $A$ .

## 7. THE RESULTS OF SOME EXPERIMENTS

To test our algorithm, we used various types and sizes of matrices. We start with random examples, and finish with “tumor-type” examples, i.e. with matrices consisting of a few connected “blocks” of ones, while the other elements are zeros.

For each example, we provide the following data. We give our test matrix  $f_i$ , then the output matrix  $S_i$  of our algorithm. We only used the line sums of  $f_i$  to obtain  $S_i$ . If  $S_i \neq f_i$ , we also indicate a third “difference” matrix  $D_i$ , having the symbols  $\cdot$  and  $*$  as entries. Here  $\cdot$  means that the original matrix  $f_i$  and the output matrix  $S_i$  have the same entries at this point, while  $*$  means that these values are different. Finally, tables containing the data are given. For the parameter values we chose  $p_1 = 0.6$ ,  $p_2 = \max(m, n)$ ,  $p_3 = 0.5$ ,  $p_4 = 0.5$  in each case. By the number of differences in the tables we mean the number of  $*$ ’s.

In all examples we have tested we found a 0 – 1-solution, but of course there is no guarantee that this will happen. All presented solutions have the right line sums by construction. By the precious help of Szabolcs Tengely, our algorithm was implemented in the linear algebraic program package MATLAB (see [12]). The program was run on a Celeron 566 MHz PC.

### Random examples.

In this section we provide some random examples. We also include a “quasi-crystal” example, the third one, which was generated by the rule

$$f_3(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \{i\sqrt{2} + j\sqrt{3}\} > 1/2, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is interesting to note that the behaviour of this matrix is comparable with a random matrix. Probably because of the larger set of 0 – 1-solutions the running time is shorter and the number of differences larger.

[illegible]

Size of $f_1$ :	$15 \times 15$
Number of differences:	82
Running time:	558.53 sec

*Example 1.*

[illegible]

Size of $f_2$ :	$15 \times 15$
Number of differences:	72
Running time:	665.31 sec

*Example 2.*

[illegible]

Size of $f_3$ :	$15 \times 15$
Number of differences:	94
Running time:	365.47 sec

*Example 3.*





[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

	$p_1$	$p_2$	$p_3$	$p_4$
Parameters:	0.6	25	0.5	0.5

Size of $f_5$ :	$25 \times 25$
Number of differences:	224
Running time:	9961.8 sec

*Example 5.*

**Tumor-type examples.**

In this subsection we give instances where the original matrices consist of blocks of ones. Examples 9, 10 and 11 are taken from pages 291, 292 and 293 of [3], respectively. Similarly to [3], our algorithm found the original matrix in Examples 9 and 10, and it provided a different 0–1 matrix with correct line sums in Example 11. The method used in [3] is completely different from ours.

We note that the average running time is much less than in case of random examples. It is not surprising, because such matrices are orthogonal to “almost” all mills. Hence they are relatively close to the shortest real solution of the original equation system determined by the line sums.

$$f_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad S_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$D_6 = \begin{pmatrix} . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . \end{pmatrix}$$

	$p_1$	$p_2$	$p_3$	$p_4$
Parameters:	0.6	15	0.5	0.5

Size of $f_6$ :	$15 \times 15$
Number of differences:	56
Running time:	648.17 sec

Example 6.

[illegible]

$$S_7 = f_7$$

	$p_1$	$p_2$	$p_3$	$p_4$
Parameters:	0.6	14	0.5	0.5

Size of $f_7$ :	$15 \times 15$
Number of differences:	0
Running time:	16.2 sec

*Example 7.*

[illegible]

$$S_8 = f_8$$

	$p_1$	$p_2$	$p_3$	$p_4$
Parameters:	0.6	30	0.5	0.5

Size of $f_8$ :	$30 \times 30$
Number of differences:	0
Running time:	411.56 sec

*Example 8.*

$$S_9 = f_9$$

Size of $f_9$ :	$29 \times 46$
Number of differences:	0
Running time:	462.8 sec

*Example 9.*

$$S_{10} = f_{10}$$

Size of $f_{10}$ :	$26 \times 41$
Number of differences:	0
Running time:	267.27 sec

*Example 10.*

$$f_{11} =$$

The algorithm finds a solution  $S_{11}$ , which differs from  $f_{11}$  only at

$$S_{11}(5, 7) = S_{11}(9, 22) = S_{11}(20, 3) = S_{11}(24, 18) = 1,$$

$$S_{11}(5, 18) = S_{11}(9, 3) = S_{11}(20, 22) = S_{11}(24, 7) = 0.$$

	$p_1$	$p_2$	$p_3$	$p_4$
Parameters:	0.6	35	0.5	0.5

Size of $f_{11}$ :	$36 \times 42$
Number of differences:	8
Running time:	2901.1 sec

*Example 11.*

## 8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The first author is grateful to Leiden University for its hospitality during this research. The authors thank Szabolcs Tengely for implementing the algorithm in the program package MATLAB.

## REFERENCES

- [1] E. Barucci, A. Del Lungo, M. Nivat, R. Pinzani, *Reconstructing convex polynominoes from horizontal and vertical projections*, Theor. Computer Sc. **155** (1996), 321–347.
- [2] B. M. Carvalho, G. T. Herman, S. Matej, C. Salzberg and E. Vardi, *Binary Tomography for Triplane Cardiology*, IPMT'99 (A. Kuba, M. Samal and A. Todd-Pokropek, eds.), LNCS 1613, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1999, pp. 29–41.
- [3] Y. Censor and S. Matej, *Binary Steering of Nonbinary Iterative Algorithms*, Discrete Tomography: Foundations, Algorithms and Applications (G. T. Herman, A. Kuba, eds.), Appl. Numer. Harmon. Anal., Birkhäuser, Boston, 1999, pp. 285–296.
- [4] S.-K. Chang and C. K. Chow, *The Reconstruction of Three-Dimensional Objects from Two Orthogonal Projections and its Application to Cardiac Cineangiography*, IEEE Trans. on Computers **22** (1973), 18–28.
- [5] A. Del Lungo and M. Nivat, *Reconstruction of connected sets from two projections*, Discrete Tomography: Foundations, Algorithms and Applications (G. T. Herman, A. Kuba, eds.), Appl. Numer. Harmon. Anal., Birkhäuser, Boston, 1999, pp. 163–188.
- [6] P. Fishburn, P. Schwander, L. Schepp and R. J. Vanderbei, *The Discrete Radon Transform and its Approximate Inversion via Linear Programming*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **75** (1997), 39–61.
- [7] R. J. Gardner, P. Gritzmann, *Discrete tomography: determination of finite sets by X-rays*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **6** (1997), 2271–2295.
- [8] P. Gritzmann, D. Prangenberg, S. de Vries, M. Wiegmann, *Success and failure of certain reconstruction and uniqueness algorithms in discrete tomography*, Int. J. Imaging Syst. and Technol. **9** (1998), 101–109.
- [9] P. Gritzmann, S. de Vries, M. Wiegmann, *Approximating binary images from discrete X-rays*, SIAM J. Optimization (to appear).
- [10] L. Hajdu and R. Tijdeman, *Algebraic aspects of discrete tomography*, J. Reine Angew. Math. (to appear).
- [11] C. L. Lawson and R. J. Hanson, *Solving least squares problems*, Prentice-Hall Series in Automatic Computation, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1974, pp. xii+340.
- [12] Math Works, *Student's Edition of MATLAB Version 4.0 User's Guide*, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1995, pp. 834.

LAJOS HAJDU  
 UNIVERSITY OF DEBRECEN  
 INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS  
 P.O. BOX 12  
 4010 DEBRECEN  
 HUNGARY

ROBERT TIJDEMAN  
 LEIDEN UNIVERSITY  
 MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE  
 P.O. BOX 9512  
 2300 RA LEIDEN  
 THE NETHERLANDS

*E-mail address:*  
 hajdul@math.klte.hu  
 tijdeman@math.leidenuniv.nl