

CROSSING NUMBERS AND STRESS OF RANDOM GRAPHS

MARKUS CHIMANI, HANNA DÖRING, AND MATTHIAS REITZNER

ABSTRACT. Consider a random geometric graph over a random point process in \mathbb{R}^d . Two points are connected by an edge if and only if their distance is bounded by a prescribed distance parameter. We show that projecting the graph onto a two dimensional plane is expected to yield a constant-factor crossing number (and rectilinear crossing number) approximation. We also show that the crossing number is positively correlated to the stress of the graph's projection.

KEYWORDS. graph crossing number, random geometric graphs, Poisson point process, expectation, stress

1. INTRODUCTION

An undirected *abstract* graph G_0 consists of vertices and edges connecting vertex pairs. An *injection* of G_0 into \mathbb{R}^d is an injective map from the vertices of G_0 to \mathbb{R}^d , and edges onto curves between their corresponding end points but not containing any other vertex point. For $d \geq 3$, we may assume that distinct edges do not share any point (other than a common end point). For $d = 2$, we call the injection a *drawing*, and it may be necessary to have points where curves *cross*. A drawing is *good* if no pair of edges crosses more than once, nor meets tangentially, and no three edges share the same crossing point. Given a drawing D , we define its crossing number $\text{cr}(D)$ as the number of points where edges cross. The crossing number $\text{cr}(G_0)$ of the graph itself is the smallest $\text{cr}(D)$ over all its good drawings D . We may restrict our attention to the *rectilinear crossing number* $\overline{\text{cr}}(G_0)$, where edge curves are straight lines; note that $\overline{\text{cr}}(G_0) \geq \text{cr}(G_0)$.

The crossing number and its variants have been studied for several decades, see, e.g., [30], but still many questions are widely open. We know the crossing numbers only for very few graph classes; already for $\text{cr}(K_n)$, i.e., for complete graphs with n vertices, we only have conjectures, and for $\overline{\text{cr}}(K_n)$ not even them. Since deciding $\text{cr}(G_0)$ is NP-complete [14] (and $\overline{\text{cr}}$ even $\exists\text{R}$ -complete [4]), several attempts for approximation algorithms have been undertaken. The problem does not allow a PTAS unless $\text{P}=\text{NP}$ [6]. For general graphs, we currently do not know whether there is an α -approximation for any constant α . However, we can achieve constant ratios for dense graphs [13] and for bounded pathwidth graphs [3]. Other strong algorithms deal with graphs of maximum bounded degree and achieve either slightly sublinear ratios [12], or constant ratios for further restrictions such as embeddability on low-genus surfaces [15–17] or a bounded number of graph elements to remove to obtain planarity [7, 9–11].

We will make use of the *crossing lemma*, originally due to [2, 24]¹: There are constants² $d \geq 4, c \geq \frac{1}{64}$ such that any abstract graph G_0 on n vertices and $m \geq dn$ edges has $\text{cr}(G_0) \geq cm^3/n^2$. In particular for (dense) graphs with $m = \Theta(n^2)$, this yields the asymptotically tight maximum of $\Theta(m^2)$ crossings.

A preliminary version of this research appeared in Proc. Int'l Symp. on Graph Drawing and Network Vis. (GD 2018), LNCS 11282, pp. 255–268.

¹Incidentally, the lemma allows an intriguingly elegant proof using stochastics [1].

²The currently best constants $d = 7, c = \frac{1}{20}$ are due to [18].

Random Geometric Graphs (RGGs). We always consider a *geometric graph* G as input, i.e., an *abstract graph* G_0 together with a straight-line injection into \mathbb{R}^d , for some $d \geq 2$; we identify the vertices with their points. For a two-dimensional plane L , the postfix operator $|_L$ denotes the projection onto L .

Given a set of points V in \mathbb{R}^d , the *unit-ball graph* (*unit-disk graph* if $d = 2$) is the geometric graph using V as vertices that has an edge between two points iff balls of radius 1 centered at these points touch or overlap. Thus, points are adjacent iff their distance is ≤ 2 . In general, we may use arbitrary threshold distances $\delta > 0$. We are interested in *random geometric graphs (RGGs)*, i.e., when using a Poisson point process to obtain V for the above graph class.

Stress. When drawing (in particular large) graphs with straight lines in practice, *stress* is a well-known and successful concept, see, e.g., [5, 19, 20]: let G be a geometric graph, d_0, d_1 two distance functions on vertex pairs—(at least) the latter of which depends on an injection—and w weights. We have:

$$(1) \quad \text{stress}(G) := \sum_{v_1, v_2 \in V(G), v_1 \neq v_2} w(v_1, v_2) \cdot (d_0(v_1, v_2) - d_1(v_1, v_2))^2.$$

In a typical scenario, G is injected into \mathbb{R}^2 , d_0 encodes the graph-theoretic distances (number of edges on the shortest path) or some given similarity matrix, and d_1 are the Euclidean distances in \mathbb{R}^2 . Intuitively, in a drawing of 0 (or low) stress, the vertices' geometric distances d_1 are (nearly) identical to their “desired” distance according to d_0 . A typical weight function $w(v_1, v_2) := d_0(v_1, v_2)^{-2}$ softens the effect of “bad” geometric injections for vertices that are far away from each other anyhow. It has been observed *empirically* that low-stress drawings *tend* to be visually pleasing and to have a low number of crossings, see, e.g., [8, 21]. While it may seem worthwhile to approximate the crossing number by minimizing a drawing's stress, there is no sound mathematical basis for this approach.

There are different ways to find (close to) minimal-stress drawings in 2D [5]. One way is multidimensional scaling, cf. [19], where we start with an injection of an abstract graph G_0 into some high-dimensional space \mathbb{R}^d and asking for a projection of it onto \mathbb{R}^2 with minimal stress. It should be understood that Euclidean distances in a unit-ball graph in \mathbb{R}^d by construction closely correspond to the graph-theoretic distances. In fact, for such graphs it seems reasonable to use the distances in \mathbb{R}^d as the given metrics d_0 , and seek an injection into \mathbb{R}^2 —whose resulting distances form d_1 —by means of projection.

Contribution. We consider RGGs for large t and investigate the mean, variance, and corresponding law of large numbers both for their rectilinear crossing number and their minimal stress when projecting them onto the plane. We also prove, for the first time, a positive correlation between these two measures.

While our technical proofs make heavy use of stochastic machinery, the consequences are very algorithmic: We give a surprisingly simple algorithm that yields an *expected constant* approximation ratio for random geometric graphs even in the pure abstract setting. In fact, we can state the algorithm already now; the remainder of this paper deals with the proof of its properties and correctness:

Algorithm 1. *Given a random geometric graph G in \mathbb{R}^d , we pick a random two-dimensional plane L in \mathbb{R}^d to obtain a straight-line drawing $G|_L$ by projecting G onto L .*

Throughout this paper, we prefer to work within the setting of a Poisson point process because of the strong mathematical tools that are available in this case. It is straightforward to transfer the computations to the binomial setting (which is the case of n uniform random points in W) instead of a Poisson point process. As a particular example we compute in Section 7 the expected crossing number in this setting.

2. A STROLL THROUGH THE CORE RESULTS

In this paper, we combine questions of graph theory with modern approaches from stochastics. As such, we are aware that many readers typically interested in crossing numbers and related concepts, may not be intrinsically versed in the finer details of the latter. Yet, they may want to understand the graph theoretic and algorithmic consequences. As such, before we go into the details of actually proving our results rigorously, we summarize our findings in this section in a hopefully comparably light-reading style. Some readers, when only interested in the gist of the results and their algorithmic and graph theoretic consequences, may find this section sufficient; others may deem it a helpful start to understand the organization of the subsequent sections. Generally, the results stated within this section will often only describe bounds in terms of asymptotics (using \mathcal{O} -notation); more specific constants can be found in the detailed results in the sections thereafter.

We always consider *random* geometric graphs that sample the vertex set by a random process. A traditional approach, in particular in algorithmics, would be to first decide on a number n of vertices, and then sample each point p in \mathbb{R}^d by picking each of the d coordinates independently and uniformly at random between some upper and lower bounds. For uniform bounds, this sample space is a d -dimensional hypercube, and as such *not rotation invariant*: intuitively, this means that when projecting the high-dimensional point set onto a 2D-plane, different angular positions of the plane relative to the coordinate system will, in general, lead to vastly different results. In contrast to this, we will sometimes also consider a mathematically more well-behaved *rotation invariant* sample spaces: the one where each point is picked uniformly at random within a d -dimensional hypersphere. We note that algorithmically sampling this space, although not as trivial as the aforementioned process, is well understood.

Furthermore, our results are mathematically easier to show for a *Poisson point process* instead of for a predetermined number of vertices n . Thereby, the resulting number of points itself is subject to the random process, and we only prescribe the *expected* number of vertices. The intuitive benefit is that at any point in time, we have a non-zero probability of a further point being sampled. This will probably become most evident when discussing the computation of variances and covariances, where the so-called *Slivnyak-Mecke formula* plays a crucial role. However, see Section 7 for a discussion on the results for “binomial input”.

Throughout the paper, all our upper bounds arise from projections of a (potentially high-dimensional) straight-line drawing; they are thus witnesses for $\overline{\text{cr}}$. All our lower bounds are based on the crossing lemma for general drawings, witnessing cr . Thus, since $\text{cr}(G_0) \leq \overline{\text{cr}}(G_0)$ for any abstract graph G_0 , all our results hold for cr and $\overline{\text{cr}}$ simultaneously.

The first important tool to be used is that of *U-statistics*, to be defined in the subsequent Section 3. Intuitively, it describes properties of measures that allow for certain strong stochastic machinery to be used. We will see that the rectilinear crossing number and the stress of a graph are such U-statistics. Based thereon, we are then able to derive in Section 4.2.1:

Theorem 2 (see Theorem 12). *Let G_0 be the underlying abstract graph of a random geometric graph G in \mathbb{R}^d with n vertices and m edges. For any two-dimensional projection plane L , we have:*

$$\text{cr}(G_0) \leq \overline{\text{cr}}(G_0) \leq \mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G|_L) \in \Theta \left(\frac{m^3}{n^2} \cdot \left(\frac{m}{n^2} \right)^{\frac{2-d}{d}} \right).$$

Observe that the fraction $\frac{m}{n^2}$ is essentially the density of the graph, measured as its ratio w.r.t. a complete graph.

Once the expectation is established, it is interesting to understand how close actual randomized computations are expected to be to this expected value. In Section 4.2.2, Theorem 13 we will show that the variance $\text{Var}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G|_L) \ll \mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G|_L)$ and a corresponding law of large numbers (Corollary 14). This allows us to deduce:

Corollary 3. *The observed crossing number will be very close to $\mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G|_L)$ with high probability.*

Combining these two results with the above crossing lemma $\overline{\text{cr}}(G_0) \geq \text{cr}(G_0) \in \Omega(m^3/n^2)$, we directly obtain our two central approximation results. They constitute the first (expected) crossing number approximations for a rich class of randomized graphs:

Corollary 4. *Let G be a random geometric graph in \mathbb{R}^2 (unit-disk graph), and G_0 its underlying abstract graph. With high probability, the number of crossings in its natural straight-line drawing is at most a constant factor away from $\text{cr}(G_0)$ and $\overline{\text{cr}}(G_0)$.*

Corollary 5. *Let G be a random geometric graph in \mathbb{R}^d (unit-ball graph, for some constant $d \geq 3$), and G_0 its underlying abstract graph. We obtain a straight-line drawing D by projecting it onto a randomly chosen two-dimensional plane. With high probability, the number of crossings in D is at most a factor α away from $\text{cr}(G_0)$ and $\overline{\text{cr}}(G_0)$. Thereby, α is only dependent on the graph's density. If the latter is constant, so is α .*

In Section 4.3.1 we turn our attention to asking whether it may be beneficial to not pick some arbitrary fixed projection plane, but to choose the plane randomly. This leads to the question whether we can find a particularly good projection plane by trying several ones at random. For this question, we restrict ourselves to rotation invariant sampling spaces. Considering non-invariant spaces does not seem futile, but would come at the cost of very tedious and lengthy computations, without us learning much more than from the invariant case. The obvious benefit of the latter is that $\text{Var}_L \mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G|_L) = 0$, i.e., all planes have the same chance of being “good”.

In Theorem 18 we show that, when picking L in the invariant setting, both the expected rectilinear crossing number and its variance are of the same asymptotic order as for the previous case, but now with better constants. We again yield a corresponding law of large numbers (Corollary 19). However, the most interesting result here is:

Theorem 6 (see Theorem 17). *The chance of picking a plane that yields a significantly better crossing number for an n -vertex RGG than the expected value is in $\mathcal{O}(1/\exp(\sqrt[4]{t}))$ where \exp is an exponentially growing function.*

Thus, we are expected to require an exponential number of tries in order to find a particularly “good” projection plane, i.e., one that yields significantly fewer crossings than any random plane. This complexity results suggests that it may be worthwhile to combine the search for an optimal projection plane with other techniques.

To this end, we turn our attention to the stress of RRGs: as discussed in Section 1, one way of obtaining stress-minimal drawings is to use multi-dimensional scaling—a close relative to our projection problem. In Section 5 we show expectation and variance for stress (Theorem 21) using analogous techniques as above. In this context, however, we do *not* consider the graph theoretic distance as our target metric d_0 , but the distances in the high-dimensional injection intrinsic to G . We then use these results in Section 6 to, for the first time, prove a strictly positive correlation between the optimal stress of a graph and its crossing number:

Theorem 7 (see Theorem 23 and Corollary 24). *Let G be a random geometric graph G , not necessarily in the rotation invariant case, and L a two-dimensional plane that may or may not be chosen at random. Then the correlation between the expected rectilinear crossing number and the expected stress is positive (as the number of vertices tends to infinity).*

Loosely speaking, this tells us that optimizing the stress of a graph drawing, we are—in expectation—at the same time automatically optimizing for the crossing number.

We need to be careful in understanding the above scenarios, however: Our results always assume a random input graph. There are, in fact, specific graphs that may arise in the random process (sporadically), for which there is neither a reasonable projection (w.r.t. its crossing number), nor do they exhibit a positive correlation between crossing number and stress.

3. NOTATIONS AND TOOLS FROM STOCHASTIC GEOMETRY

Let $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex set of volume $\lambda_d(W) = 1$. Choose a Poisson distributed random variable n with parameter t , i.e., $\mathbb{E}n = t$. Next choose n points $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ independently in W according to the uniform distribution. Those points form a Poisson point process V in W of intensity t . A Poisson point process has several nice properties, e.g., for disjoint subsets $A, B \subset W$, the sets $V \cap A$ and $V \cap B$ are independent (thus also their size is independent). Let V_{\neq}^k , $k \geq 1$, be the set of all ordered k -tuples over V with pairwise distinct elements. We will consider V as the vertex set of a geometric graph G for the distances parameter $(\delta_t)_{t>0}$ with edges $E = \{\{u, v\} \mid u, v \in V, u \neq v, \|u - v\| \leq \delta_t\}$, i.e., we have an edge between two distinct points if and only if their distance is at most δ_t . Such *random geometric graphs (RGG)* have been extensively investigated, see, e.g., [26, 29], but nothing is known about the stress or crossing number of its underlying abstract graph G_0 .

A *U-statistic* $U_k(f) := \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in V_{\neq}^k} f(\mathbf{v})$ is the sum over $f(\mathbf{v})$ for all k -tuples \mathbf{v} . Here, f is a measurable non-negative real-valued function, and $f(\mathbf{v})$ only depends on \mathbf{v} and is independent of the rest of V . The number of edges in G is a U-statistic as $m = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v, u \in V, v \neq u} \mathbb{1}(\|v - u\| \leq \delta_t)$. Likewise, the stress of a geometric graph as well as the crossing number of a straight-line drawing is a U-statistic, using 2- and 4-tuples of V , respectively. The well-known multivariate Slivnyak-Mecke formula, which we use here in a simple form, tells us how to compute the expectation \mathbb{E}_V over all realizations of the Poisson process V ; for U-statistics we have, see [31, Cor. 3.2.3]:

$$(2) \quad \mathbb{E}_V \sum_{(v_1, \dots, v_k) \in V_{\neq}^k} f(v_1, \dots, v_k) = t^k \int_{W^k} f(v_1, \dots, v_k) dv_1 \cdots dv_k.$$

We already know $\mathbb{E}_V n = \mathbb{E}_V |V| = t$. Solving the above formula for the expected number of edges, we obtain

$$(3) \quad \mathbb{E}_V m = \mathbb{E}_V |E| = \frac{\kappa_d}{2} t^2 \delta_t^d + \mathcal{O}(t^2 \delta_t^{d+1} \text{surf}(W)),$$

where $\kappa_d = \lambda_d(B_d)$ is the volume of the unit ball B_d in \mathbb{R}^d , and $\text{surf}(W)$ the surface area of W . For n and m , central limit theorems and concentration inequalities are well known as $t \rightarrow \infty$, see, e.g., [26, 29].

The expected degree $\mathbb{E}_V \deg(v)$ of a typical vertex v is approximately of order $\kappa_d t \delta_t^d$ (this can be made precise using Palm distributions). This naturally leads to three different asymptotic *regimes* as introduced in Penrose's book [26]:

- in the *sparse regime* we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t \delta_t^d = 0$, thus $\mathbb{E}_V \deg(v)$ tends to zero;
- in the *thermodynamic regime* we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t \delta_t^d = c > 0$, thus $\mathbb{E}_V \deg(v)$ is asymptotically constant;
- in the *dense regime* we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t \delta_t^d = \infty$, thus $\mathbb{E}_V \deg(v) \rightarrow \infty$.

Observe that in standard graph theoretic terms, the *thermodynamic regime* leads to *sparse graphs*, i.e., via (3) we obtain $\mathbb{E}_V m = \Theta(t) = \Theta(\mathbb{E}_V n)$. Similarly, the dense regime— together with $\delta_t \rightarrow c$ —leads to *dense graphs*, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_V m = \Theta(t^2) = \Theta((\mathbb{E}_V n)^2)$. Recall that to employ the crossing lemma, we want $m \geq 4n$. Also, the lemma already shows that any good (straight-line) drawing of a dense graph G_0 already gives a constant-factor

approximation for $\text{cr}(G_0)$ (and $\overline{\text{cr}}(G_0)$). In the following we thus assume a constant $0 < c \leq t \delta_t^d$ and $\delta_t \rightarrow 0$, i.e., $m = o(n^2)$.

The Slivnyak-Mecke formula is a classical tool to compute expectations and will thus be used extensively throughout this paper. Yet, suitable methods to compute variances came up only recently. They emerged in connection with the development of the Malliavin calculus for Poisson point processes [23, 25]. This is due to the fact that the Wiener-Itô chaos expansion is particularly well-behaved for Poisson U-statistics [28]. An important operator for functions $g(V)$ of Poisson point processes is the *difference* (also called *add-one-cost*) operator,

$$D_v g(V) := g(V \cup \{v\}) - g(V),$$

which considers the change in the function value when adding a single further point v .

4. RECTILINEAR CROSSING NUMBER OF AN RGG

Let \mathcal{L} be the set of all two-dimensional linear planes and $L \in \mathcal{L}$ be a random plane chosen according to a (uniform) Haar probability measure on \mathcal{L} . The drawing $G_L := G|_L$ is the projection of G onto L . Let $[u, v]$ denote the segment between vertex points $u, v \in V$. If their distance has to be at most δ_t , this condition is explicitly given by an indicator function or the domain of the integral. The rectilinear crossing number of G_L is a U-statistic of order 4:

$$\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) = \frac{1}{8} \sum_{(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) \in V_{\neq}^4} \mathbb{1}([v_1, v_2]|_L \cap [v_3, v_4]|_L \neq \emptyset, \|v_1 - v_2\| \leq \delta_t, \|v_3 - v_4\| \leq \delta_t).$$

Keep in mind that even for the best possible projection we only obtain $\min_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) \geq \overline{\text{cr}}(G_0)$. Analyzing $\mathbb{E}_V \min_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)$ is more complicated than $\mathbb{E}_{L, V} \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)$; fortunately, we will not require it.

4.1. Calculations of some Geometric Integrals. The following integrals show up in several calculations and play an essential role in determining the asymptotic behavior of the moments of $\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)$.

Lemma 8. *Let K be a convex body and L a 2-dimensional plane in \mathbb{R}^d . Define*

$$J_L^{(1)}(K) := \int_{(\delta_t B_d) \times K \times (\delta_t B_d)} \mathbb{1}([0, x]|_L \cap (y + [0, z])|_L \neq \emptyset) dz dy dx.$$

Then, $J_L^{(1)}(K) = c_d \delta_t^{2d+2} \lambda_{d-2}(L^\perp \cap K) (1 + o(1))$ as $\delta_t \rightarrow 0$, with

$$(4) \quad c_d = 8\pi \kappa_{d-2}^2 \mathbf{B}\left(3, \frac{d}{2}\right)^2$$

for \mathbf{B} being the beta function. Furthermore, we have $J_L^{(1)}(K) \leq c_d \delta_t^{2d+2} M_{d-2}(K)$ where $M_{d-2}(K)$ is the volume of the maximal $(d-2)$ -dimensional section of K .

Proof. We write $y = (y^L, y^{L^\perp})$ with $y^L \in L, y^{L^\perp} \in L^\perp$. Clearly, for $[y, z]$ to meet $[0, x]$ we need that y is at least contained in a cylinder of radius $2\delta_t$ above the origin, $y^L \in 2\delta_t B_2 \subset L$.

Using Fubini's theorem we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
J_L^{(1)}(K) &= \int_{(\delta_t B_d) \times K \times (\delta_t B_d)} \mathbb{1}([0, x] \cap (y + [0, z]) \neq \emptyset) dz dy dx \\
&= \int_{\substack{(\delta_t B_d) \times \\ (2\delta_t B_2 \cap K|_L) \times \\ (\delta_t B_d)}} \mathbb{1}([0, x|_L] \cap (y^L + [0, z|_L]) \neq \emptyset) \int_{L^\perp} \mathbb{1}((y^L, y^{L^\perp}) \in K) dy^{L^\perp} dz dy^L dx \\
&= \int_{\substack{(\delta_t B_d) \times \\ (2\delta_t B_2 \cap K|_L) \times \\ (\delta_t B_d)}} \mathbb{1}([0, x|_L] \cap (y^L + [0, z|_L]) \neq \emptyset) \cdot \lambda_{d-2}((y^L + L^\perp) \cap K) dz dy^L dx \\
&\leq \delta_t^{2d+2} \int_{\substack{B_d \times \\ (2B_2) \times \\ B_d}} \mathbb{1}([0, x|_L] \cap (y^L + [0, z|_L]) \neq \emptyset) \cdot \lambda_{d-2}((\delta_t y^L + L^\perp) \cap K) dz dy^L dx \\
&\leq c_d \delta_t^{2d+2} \max_{u \in \delta_t B_d} \lambda_{d-2}((u + L^\perp) \cap K)
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
c_d &= \int_{B_d \times (2B_2) \times B_d} \mathbb{1}([0, x|_L] \cap (y^L + [0, z|_L]) \neq \emptyset) dz dy^L dx \\
&= \int_{2B_2} \int_{B_d^2} \mathbb{1}([0, x^L] \cap (y^L + [0, z^L]) \neq \emptyset) dz^L dz^{L^\perp} dx^L dx^{L^\perp} dy^L \\
&= \int_{B_2^2} \int_{2B_2} \mathbb{1}(y^L \in [0, x^L] + [0, -z^L]) dy^L \kappa_{d-2}^2 (1 - \|z^L\|)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} (1 - \|x^L\|)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} dz^L dx^L \\
&= \kappa_{d-2}^2 \int_{B_2^2} V_2([0, x^L] + [0, -z^L]) (1 - \|z^L\|)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} (1 - \|x^L\|)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} dz^L dx^L.
\end{aligned}$$

Changing to polar coordinates gives

$$\begin{aligned}
c_d &= \kappa_{d-2}^2 \int_{S_1^2} \int_{[0,1]^2} |\det(r_1 u_1, r_2 u_2)| (1 - r_1)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} (1 - r_2)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} r_1 r_2 dr_1 dr_2 du_1 du_2 \\
&= 2\pi \kappa_{d-2}^2 \mathbf{B}\left(3, \frac{d}{2}\right)^2 \int_{S_1} |\det(e_1, u_2)| du_2 \\
&= 2\pi \kappa_{d-2}^2 \mathbf{B}\left(3, \frac{d}{2}\right)^2 \int_0^{2\pi} |\sin \alpha| d\alpha = 8\pi \kappa_{d-2}^2 \mathbf{B}\left(3, \frac{d}{2}\right)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

with $\mathbf{B}(x, y) = \int_0^1 r^{x-1} (1-r)^{y-1} dr$ being the beta function. Analogously,

$$J_L^{(1)}(K) \geq c_d \delta_t^{2d+2} \mathbb{1}(2\delta_t B_2 \subset K|_L) \min_{u \in \delta_t B_d} \lambda_{d-2}((u + L^\perp) \cap K).$$

This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

By $K_{-\delta}$ we denote the inner parallel set $\{x : (x + \delta B_d) \subset K\}$ of a convex set K .

Proposition 9. *Let v be a point in $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Then for*

$$(5) \quad I_{W,L}^{(1)}(v) = \int_{W^3} \mathbb{1}([v, v_2]|_L \cap [v_3, v_4]|_L \neq \emptyset, \|v - v_2\| \leq \delta_t, \|v_3 - v_4\| \leq \delta_t) dv_2 dv_3 dv_4$$

it holds that

$$(6) \quad \lim_{\delta_t \rightarrow 0} \frac{I_{W,L}^{(1)}(v)}{\delta_t^{2d+2}} = c_d \lambda_{d-2}((v + L^\perp) \cap W)$$

as $\delta_t \rightarrow 0$, with c_d given in (4). Further we have $I_{W,L}^{(1)}(v) \leq c_d \delta_t^{2d+2} M_{d-2}(W)$ where $M_{d-2}(W)$ is the volume of the maximal $(d-2)$ -dimensional section of W .

Proof. We substitute $v_2 = v + x$, $v_3 = v + y$ and $v_4 = v + y + z$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_{W,L}^{(1)}(v) &= \int_{(W-v)^2} \int_{W-v-y} \mathbb{1}([0, x]|_L \cap [y, y+z]|_L \neq \emptyset, \|x\| \leq \delta_t, \|z\| \leq \delta_t) dz dy dx \\ &= \int_{((W-v) \cap \delta_t B_d) \times (W-v) \times ((W-v-y) \cap \delta_t B_d)} \mathbb{1}([0, x]|_L \cap [y, y+z]|_L \neq \emptyset) dz dy dx \\ &\leq \int_{(\delta_t B_d) \times (W-v) \times (\delta_t B_d)} \mathbb{1}([0, x]|_L \cap [y, y+z]|_L \neq \emptyset) dz dy dx \\ &= J_L^{(1)}(W-v) \end{aligned}$$

and on the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} I_{W,L}^{(1)}(v) &\geq \int_{(\delta_t B_d) \times (W-v) \times (\delta_t B_d)} \mathbb{1}([0, x]|_L \cap [y, y+z]|_L \neq \emptyset) \\ &\quad \mathbb{1}(\delta_t B_d \subset (W-v)) \mathbb{1}(\delta_t B_d \subset (W-v-y)) dz dy dx \\ &= \mathbb{1}(v \in W_{-\delta_t}) \int_{(\delta_t B_d) \times (W_{-\delta_t}-v) \times (\delta_t B_d)} \mathbb{1}([0, x]|_L \cap [y, y+z]|_L \neq \emptyset) dz dy dx \\ &= J_L^{(1)}(W_{-\delta_t} - v). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 8 this leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\delta_t \rightarrow 0} \frac{J_L^{(1)}(W-v)}{\delta_t^{2d+2}} &= \lim_{\delta_t \rightarrow 0} \frac{J_L^{(1)}(W_{-\delta_t} - v)}{\delta_t^{2d+2}} = \lim_{\delta_t \rightarrow 0} \frac{I_{W,L}^{(1)}(v)}{\delta_t^{2d+2}} \\ &= c_d \lambda_{d-2}(L^\perp \cap (W-v)). \end{aligned}$$

□

Analogously we prepare the following integral which will show up in the calculation of the variance.

Lemma 10. *Let K be a convex body and L a 2-dimensional plane in \mathbb{R}^d . Define*

$$\begin{aligned} J_L^{(2)}(K) &:= \int_{(\delta_t B_d) \times K^2 \times (\delta_t B_d)^2} \mathbb{1}([0, x]|_L \cap (y_1 + [0, z_1])|_L \neq \emptyset) \\ &\quad \mathbb{1}([0, x]|_L \cap (y_2 + [0, z_2])|_L \neq \emptyset) dz_1 dz_2 dy_1 dy_2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Then, $J_L^{(2)}(K) = c'_d \delta_t^{3d+4} \lambda_{d-2}(L^\perp \cap K)^2 (1 + o(1))$ as $\delta_t \rightarrow 0$, with

$$(7) \quad c'_d = \pi \kappa_{d-2}^3 \mathbf{B}\left(3, \frac{d}{2}\right)^2 \mathbf{B}\left(4, \frac{d}{2}\right).$$

Furthermore, we have $J_L^{(2)}(K) \leq c'_d \delta_t^{3d+4} M_{d-2}(K)^2$.

Proof. (similar to above) Writing $y_i = (y_i^L, y_i^{L^\perp})$ with $y_1 \in L$, $y_2 \in L^\perp$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J_L^{(2)}(K) &= \int_{\delta_t B_d \times K^2 \times (\delta_t B_d)^2} \mathbb{1}([0, x]|_L \cap (y_1 + [0, z_1])|_L \neq \emptyset) \\ &\quad \mathbb{1}([0, x]|_L \cap (y_2 + [0, z_2])|_L \neq \emptyset) dz_1 dy_1 dz_2 dy_2 dx \\ &= \int_{(\delta_t B_d) \times (2\delta_t B_2 \cap K|_L)^2 \times (\delta_t B_d)^2} \mathbb{1}([0, x|_L] \cap (y_1^L + [0, z_1|_L]) \neq \emptyset) \\ &\quad \lambda_{d-2}((y_1^L + L^\perp) \cap K) \mathbb{1}([0, x|_L] \cap (y_2^L + [0, z_2|_L]) \neq \emptyset) \\ &\quad \lambda_{d-2}((y_2^L + L^\perp) \cap K) dz_1 dy_1^L dz_2 dy_2^L dx \\ &\leq \delta_t^{3d+4} \int_{B_d \times (2B_2)^2 \times B_d^2} \mathbb{1}([0, x|_L] \cap (y_1^L + [0, z_1|_L]) \neq \emptyset) \lambda_{d-2}((y_1^L + L^\perp) \cap K) \\ &\quad \mathbb{1}([0, x|_L] \cap (y_2^L + [0, z_2|_L]) \neq \emptyset) \lambda_{d-2}((y_2^L + L^\perp) \cap K) \\ &\quad dz_1 dy_1^L dz_2 dy_2^L dx \\ &\leq c'_d \delta_t^{3d+4} \left(\max_{u \in \delta_t B_d} \lambda_{d-2}((u + L^\perp) \cap K) \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} c'_d &= \int_{B_d \times (2B_2)^2 \times B_d^2} \mathbb{1}([0, x|_L] \cap (y_1^L + [0, z_1|_L]) \neq \emptyset) \cdot \\ &\quad \mathbb{1}([0, x|_L] \cap (y_2^L + [0, z_2|_L]) \neq \emptyset) dz_1 dz_2 dy_1^L dy_2^L dx. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously,

$$J_L^{(2)}(K) \geq c'_d \delta_t^{2d+2} \mathbb{1}(2\delta_t B_2 \subset K|_L) \left(\min_{u \in \delta_t B_d} \lambda_{d-2}((u + L^\perp) \cap K) \right)^2.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 8 we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} c'_d &= \int_{B_d \times (2B_2)^2 \times B_d^2} \mathbb{1}([0, x|_L] \cap (y_1^L + [0, z_1|_L]) \neq \emptyset) \cdot \\ &\quad \mathbb{1}([0, x|_L] \cap (y_2^L + [0, z_2|_L]) \neq \emptyset) dz_1 dz_2 dy_1^L dy_2^L dx \\ &= \kappa_{d-2}^3 \int_{B_2^3} V_2([0, x^L] + [0, -z_1^L]) V_2([0, x^L] + [0, -z_2^L]) (1 - \|z_1^L\|)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \cdot \\ &\quad (1 - \|z_2^L\|)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} (1 - \|x^L\|)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} dz_1^L dz_2^L dx^L. \end{aligned}$$

Changing to polar coordinates gives

$$\begin{aligned}
c'_d &= \kappa_{d-2}^3 \int_{S_1^3} \int_{[0,1]^3} |\det(r_1 u_1, r_2 u_2)| |\det(r_1 u_1, r_3 u_3)| (1-r_1)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \\
&\quad (1-r_2)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} (1-r_3)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} r_1 r_2 r_3 dr_1 dr_2 dr_3 du_1 du_2 du_3 \\
&= \kappa_{d-2}^3 \int_{[0,1]^3} r_1^3 r_2^2 r_3^2 (1-r_1)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} (1-r_2)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} (1-r_3)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} dr_1 dr_2 dr_3 \\
&\quad \int_{S_1^3} |\det(u_1, u_2)| |\det(u_1, u_3)| du_1 du_2 du_3 \\
&= \kappa_{d-2}^3 \mathbf{B}\left(3, \frac{d}{2}\right)^2 \mathbf{B}\left(4, \frac{d}{2}\right) \int_0^{2\pi} (\cos(\alpha))^2 d\alpha \\
&= \pi \kappa_{d-2}^3 \mathbf{B}\left(3, \frac{d}{2}\right)^2 \mathbf{B}\left(4, \frac{d}{2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. \square

Proposition 11. *Let v be a point in $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Then for*

$$I_{W,L}^{(2)}(v) = \int_{W^5} \mathbb{1}([v, v_2] \cap [v_3, v_4] \neq \emptyset, \|v - v_2\| \leq \delta_t, \|v_3 - v_4\| \leq \delta_t) \\
\mathbb{1}([v, v_2] \cap [w_3, w_4] \neq \emptyset, \|w_3 - w_4\| \leq \delta_t) dv_2 dv_3 dv_4 dw_3 dw_4$$

it holds that

$$(8) \quad \lim_{\delta_t \rightarrow 0} \frac{I_{W,L}^{(2)}(v)}{\delta_t^{3d+4}} = c'_d \lambda_{d-2}((v + L^\perp) \cap W)^2$$

as $\delta_t \rightarrow 0$, with c'_d given in (7). Further we have $I_{W,L}^{(2)}(v) \leq c'_d \delta_t^{3d+4} M_{d-2}^2(W)$ where $M_{d-2}(W)$ is the volume of the maximal $(d-2)$ -dimensional section of W .

Proof. We substitute $v_2 = v + x$, $v_3 = v + y_1$ and $v_4 = v + y_1 + z_1$, and $w_3 = v + y_2$ and $w_4 = v + y_2 + z_2$, respectively. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{W,L}^{(2)}(v) &= \int_{\substack{(W-v)^3 \\ \times (W-v-y_2) \\ \times (W-v-y_1)}} \mathbb{1}([0, x] \cap (y_1 + [0, z_1]) \neq \emptyset, \|x\| \leq \delta_t, \|z_1\| \leq \delta_t) \\
&\quad \mathbb{1}([0, x] \cap (y_2 + [0, z_2]) \neq \emptyset, \|z_2\| \leq \delta_t) dz_1 dz_2 dy_1 dy_2 dx \\
&\leq \int_{(\delta_t B_d) \times (W-v)^2 \times (\delta_t B_d)^2} \mathbb{1}([0, x] \cap (y_1 + [0, z_1]) \neq \emptyset) \\
&\quad \mathbb{1}([0, x] \cap (y_2 + [0, z_2]) \neq \emptyset) dz_1 dz_2 dy_1 dy_2 dx \\
&= J_L^{(2)}(W-v).
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously to the calculations in Proposition 9, the expectation is also bounded from below by

$$J_L^{(2)}(W_{-\delta_t} - v).$$

Together with Lemma 10 this shows that the expectation equals

$$(9) \quad c'_d \delta_t^{3d+4} \lambda_{d-2}(L^\perp \cap W)^2 (1 + o(1)).$$

\square

4.2. Projecting the RGG on a Fixed Plane. In the next sections we fix an arbitrary two-dimensional plane L and investigate $\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)$ by projecting on this fixed plane.

4.2.1. The Expectation of the Rectilinear Crossing Numbers. The expectation of the rectilinear crossing numbers with respect to the underlying Poisson point process can be computed using the Slivnyak-Mecke formula (2) and by some integralgeometric investigations.

Theorem 12. *Let G_L be the projection of the RGG onto a two-dimensional plane L . Then, as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and $\delta_t \rightarrow 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) = \frac{1}{8} c_d t^4 \delta_t^{2d+2} I_W^{(2)}(L) + o(\delta_t^{2d+2} t^4),$$

where $I_W^{(2)}(L) := \int_{W|_L} \lambda_{d-2}((v + L^\perp) \cap W)^2 dv$ and c_d is defined in (4).

Proof. Recalling the definition (5), the Slivnyak-Mecke formula (2) yields

$$\mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) = \frac{1}{8} t^4 \int_W I_{W,L}^{(1)}(v_1) dv_1.$$

Now we apply (6) in Proposition 9. Using the dominated convergence theorem of Lebesgue and Fubini's theorem we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)}{t^4 \delta_t^{2d+2}} &= \frac{1}{8} c_d \int_W \lambda_{d-2}((v_1 + L^\perp) \cap W) dv_1 \\ &= \frac{1}{8} c_d \int_{W|_L} \int_{L^\perp} \lambda_{d-2}((v_1 + L^\perp) \cap W) dv_1^{L^\perp} dv_1^L \\ &= \frac{1}{8} c_d \int_{W|_L} \lambda_{d-2}((v_1^L + L^\perp) \cap W)^2 dv_1^L. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

For unit-disk graphs, i.e., $d = 2$, the choice of L is unique and the projection superfluous. There the expected crossing number is asymptotically $\frac{c_2}{8} t^4 \delta_t^6$ and thus of order $\Theta(m^3/n^2)$ which is asymptotically optimal as witnessed by the crossing lemma. In general, the expectation is of order

$$t^4 \delta_t^{2d+2} = \Theta \left(\frac{m^3}{n^2} \left(\frac{m}{n^2} \right)^{\frac{2-d}{d}} \right).$$

The extra factor m/n^2 can be understood as the probability that two vertices are connected via an edge, thus measures the ‘‘density’’ of the graph.

4.2.2. The Variance of the Rectilinear Crossing Numbers. The method to calculate the variance of U-statistics is by expanding the second moment in a suitable way and using the Slivnyak-Mecke formula. This leads to various sums over k -tuples of points where the asymptotic dominating summands have to be identified. For simplicity we concentrate on the case $d \geq 3$ since in the two-dimensional case the number of dominating terms is larger (although the computations are similar).

Theorem 13. *Let G_L be the projection of an RGG in \mathbb{R}^d , $d \geq 3$, onto a two-dimensional plane L . Then, as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and $\delta_t \rightarrow 0$,*

$$(10) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Var}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)}{t^7 \delta_t^{4d+4}} = \frac{1}{8} \left(2c_d^2 + c'_d \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t \delta_t^d} \right) I_W^{(3)}(L) = \frac{1}{8} c''_d I_W^{(3)}(L)$$

where $I_W^{(3)}(L) := \int_{W|_L} \lambda_{d-2}((v + L^\perp) \cap W)^3 dv$, c_d is defined in (4) and c'_d in (7).

Proof. For a moment we use the abbreviation

$$f(v_1, \dots, v_4) = \mathbb{1}([v_1, v_2] \cap [v_3, v_4] \neq \emptyset, \|v_1 - v_2\| \leq \delta_t, \|v_3 - v_4\| \leq \delta_t).$$

The second moment of the crossing number is given by

$$(11) \quad \mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)^2 = \frac{1}{64} \mathbb{E}_V \left(\sum_{(v_1, \dots, v_4) \in V_{\neq}^4} f(v_1, \dots, v_4) \right)^2.$$

The square of the sum yields the sum over two 4-tuples (v_1, \dots, v_4) and (w_1, \dots, w_4) which may or may not overlap. The sum over those 4-tuples which are disjoint yields by the Slivnyak-Mecke formula $(\mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L))^2$. Thus by the definition of the variance

$$(12) \quad \text{Var}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)^2 = \frac{1}{64} \mathbb{E}_V \sum_{\substack{(v_1, \dots, v_4) \in V_{\neq}^4 \\ (w_1, \dots, w_4) \in V_{\neq}^4 \\ |\{v_1, \dots, v_4\} \cap \{w_1, \dots, w_4\}| \geq 1}} f(v_1, \dots, v_4) f(w_1, \dots, w_4).$$

We start by computing the case when only one point coincides, that is, $|\{v_1, \dots, v_4\} \cap \{w_1, \dots, w_4\}| = 1$. There are 16 possibilities to choose two points from each set.

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{64} \mathbb{E}_V \sum_{\substack{(v_1, \dots, v_4) \in V_{\neq}^4 \\ (w_1, \dots, w_4) \in V_{\neq}^4 \\ |\{v_1, \dots, v_4\} \cap \{w_1, \dots, w_4\}| = 1}} f(v_1, \dots, v_4) f(w_1, \dots, w_4) = \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E}_V \sum_{(v, v_2, \dots, v_4, w_2, \dots, w_4) \in V_{\neq}^7} f(v, v_2, \dots, v_4) f(v, w_2, \dots, w_4) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} t^7 \int_W \int_{W^6} f(v, v_2, \dots, v_4) f(v, w_2, \dots, w_4) dv_2 \dots dw_4 dv \end{aligned}$$

and the inner integral equals $I_{W, L}^{(1)}(v)^2$. Now we apply again (6) in Proposition 9. Using the dominated convergence theorem of Lebesgue and Fubini's theorem we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{64} \mathbb{E}_V \sum_{\substack{(v_1, \dots, v_4) \in V_{\neq}^4 \\ (w_1, \dots, w_4) \in V_{\neq}^4 \\ |\{v_1, \dots, v_4\} \cap \{w_1, \dots, w_4\}| = 1}} f(v_1, \dots, v_4) f(w_1, \dots, w_4) = \\ &= \frac{1}{4} c_d^2 t^7 \delta_t^{4d+4} \int_{W|_L} \lambda_{d-2}((v^L + L^\perp) \cap W)^3 dv^L (1 + o(1)) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} c_d^2 t^7 \delta_t^{4d+4} I_W^{(3)}(L) (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

For all other terms in the expectation \mathbb{E}_V , at least two points of the sets $\{v_2, \dots, v_4\}$, $\{w_2, \dots, w_4\}$ coincide. We first calculate the situation where two segments coincide. Since there are two segments involved in each function and each segment consists of two points there are 8 possibilities. We calculate in particular the case $v_1 = w_1$ and $v_2 = w_2$. The Slivnyak-Mecke formula gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E}_V \sum_{v_1, \dots, v_4, w_3, w_4 \in V_{\neq}^6} f(v_1, \dots, v_4) f(v_1, v_2, w_3, w_4) \\ &= \frac{1}{8} t^6 \int_W \int_{W^5} f(v, v_2, \dots, v_4) f(v, v_2, w_3, w_4) dv_2 dv_3 dv_4 dw_3 dw_4 dv, \end{aligned}$$

and the inner integral equals $I_{W,L}^{(2)}(v)^2$. This time we apply (8) in Proposition 11. Using the dominated convergence theorem of Lebesgue and Fubini's theorem we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E}_V \sum_{v_1, \dots, v_4, w_3, w_4 \in V_{\neq}^6} f(v_1, \dots, v_4) f(v_1, v_2, w_3, w_4) \\ &= \frac{1}{8} c'_d t^6 \delta_t^{3d+4} \int_{W|_L} \lambda_{d-2}((v^L + L^\perp) \cap W)^3 dv^L (1 + o(1)) \\ &= \frac{1}{8} c'_d t^6 \delta_t^{3d+4} I_W^{(3)}(L) (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

Similar investigations show that in the case where two points in different segments coincide we obtain terms of order $\mathcal{O}(t^6 \delta_t^{4d+2})$. The case when three points coincide yields terms of order at most $\mathcal{O}(t^5 \delta_t^{3d+2})$. If all points of the two 4-tuples coincide we obtain the expectation of the crossing numbers which is $\mathcal{O}(t^4 \delta_t^{2d+2})$.

Combining our results we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) &= \frac{1}{8} t^7 \delta_t^{4d+4} (2c_d^2 + c'_d t^{-1} \delta_t^{-d}) I_W^{(3)}(L) (1 + o(1)) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(t^6 \delta_t^{4d+2}) + \mathcal{O}(t^5 \delta_t^{3d+2}) + \mathcal{O}(t^4 \delta_t^{2d+2}). \end{aligned}$$

Since we assume $d \geq 3$ and that $t \delta_t^d \geq c$, this leads to (10). \square

Theorem 12 and Theorem 13 show for the standard deviation

$$\sigma(\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)) = \sqrt{\text{Var}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)} = \Theta(t^4 \delta_t^{2d+2} t^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = \Theta(\mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) t^{-\frac{1}{2}}),$$

which is smaller than the expectation. Or, equivalently, the coefficient of variation $\frac{\sigma(\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L))}{\mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)}$ is of order $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. As $t \rightarrow \infty$, our bounds on the expectation and variance together with Chebychev's inequality lead to

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)}{t^4 \delta_t^{2d+2}} - \frac{\mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)}{t^4 \delta_t^{2d+2}} \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{\text{Var}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)}{t^8 \delta_t^{4d+4} \varepsilon^2} \rightarrow 0.$$

Recalling $I_W^{(2)}(L)$ defined in Theorem 12, we can state

Corollary 14 (Law of Large Numbers). *For given L , the normalized random crossing number converges in probability (with respect to the Poisson point process V) as $t \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)}{t^4 \delta_t^{2d+2}} \rightarrow \frac{1}{8} c_d I_W^{(2)}(L).$$

4.2.3. Deviation Inequalities. As known by the crossing lemma, the optimal crossing number is of order $\Omega(\frac{m^3}{n^2})$. In our setting this means that we are looking for crossing numbers of order $t^4 \delta_t^{3d}$, much smaller than the expectation $\mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)$. Chebychev's inequality shows that it is difficult to reach this order of magnitude; using $\delta_t \rightarrow 0$ in the last step we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_V(\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) \leq c t^4 \delta_t^{3d}) &\leq \mathbb{P}_V(|\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) - \mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)| \geq \mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) - c t^4 \delta_t^{3d}) \\ &\leq \frac{\text{Var}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)}{(\mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) - c t^4 \delta_t^{3d})^2} = \mathcal{O}(t^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

To get a more precise inequality we use a large deviation inequality from [22], which follows from a general isoperimetric inequality on Poisson spaces for the convex distance, see [27, 29]. Let $U = U_k(f)$ be a U-statistic of order k , and denote by $U(v)$ the local version of the U-statistic U ,

$$U(v) = \sum_{(v_2, \dots, v_k) \in (V \setminus \{v\})^{k-1}} f(v, v_2, \dots, v_k)$$

so that $U = \sum_{v \in V} U(v)$.

Theorem 15 (see [22, Theorem 8]). *Let $U = U_k(f)$ be a Poisson U -statistic of order k , and let MU be the median of U . Then for $u \geq 0$ and arbitrary $B > 0$,*

$$(13) \quad \mathbb{P}(U \leq \text{MU} - u) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{u^2}{4k^2 B \text{MU}}\right) + 2\mathbb{P}(\exists v : U(v) > B).$$

We need to compute a uniform upper bound for $\mathbb{P}(U(v) > B)$ since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\exists v : U(v) > B) &\leq \mathbb{E} \sum_{v \in V} \mathbb{1}(U(v) > B) \\ &= t \int_W \mathbb{P}(U(v) > B) dv \\ &\leq t \max_v \mathbb{P}(U(v) > B). \end{aligned}$$

To apply this for the crossing numbers observe that in our case we investigate $U = U_4(f) = \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} f(v, v_2, v_3, v_4) &= \mathbb{1}([v, v_2] \cap [v_3, v_4] \neq \emptyset, \|v - v_2\| \leq \delta_t, \|v_3 - v_4\| \leq \delta_t) \\ &\leq \mathbb{1}(v_2 \in B(v, \delta_t), v_3 \in B_L(v, 2\delta_t) + L^\perp, v_4 \in B(v_3, \delta_t)). \end{aligned}$$

To gain more independence we distinguish whether $B(v, \delta_t)$ is disjoint from $B(v_3, \delta_t)$ or not.

$$\begin{aligned} U(v) &= \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)(v) \\ &\leq \sum_{V_\neq^3} \mathbb{1}(v_2, v_3, v_4 \in B(v, 2\delta_t)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{V_\neq^3} \mathbb{1}(v_2 \in B(v, \delta_t), v_3 \in (B_L(v, 2\delta_t) + L^\perp) \setminus B(v, 2\delta_t), v_4 \in B(v_3, \delta_t)). \end{aligned}$$

Denote by N_1 a Poisson distributed random variable with mean $E_1 = t(2\delta_t)^d \kappa_d$, by N_2, N_4 independent Poisson distributed random variables with mean $E_2 = E_4 = t\delta_t^d \kappa_d$, and by N_3 an independent Poisson distributed random variable with mean $E_3 = t(2\delta_t)^2 \pi M_{d-2}(W)$, where $M_{d-2}(W)$ is the maximal $(d-2)$ -dimensional section of W . Because $\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)(v)$ is stochastically dominated by $N_1^3 + N_2 N_3 N_4$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_v \mathbb{P}(\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)(v) > B) &\leq \mathbb{P}(N_1^3 + N_2 N_3 N_4 > B) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(N_1^3 > \frac{1}{2}B\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(N_2 N_3 N_4 > \frac{1}{2}B\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(N_1 > \left(\frac{1}{2}B\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\right) + \prod_{i=2,3,4} \mathbb{P}\left(N_i > \left(\frac{1}{2}B\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to estimate the two summands. Starting with the estimate for the probability that $N_i > \left(\frac{1}{2}B\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}$, we use the Chernoff bound for the Poisson distribution, namely

$$(14) \quad \mathbb{P}(N_i > r) \leq \inf_{s \geq 0} e^{E_i(e^s - 1) - sr}.$$

Since

$$\inf_{s \geq 0} E_i(e^s - 1) - sr = r(1 - \ln \frac{r}{E_i}) - E_i \leq -r$$

for $r \geq E_i e^2$, we obtain the estimate

$$\mathbb{P}\left(N_1^3 > \frac{1}{2}B\right) + \prod_{i=2,3,4} \mathbb{P}\left(N_i > \left(\frac{1}{2}B\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\right) \leq e^{-\left(\frac{1}{2}B\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}} + e^{-3\left(\frac{1}{2}B\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}}$$

for $B \geq \max(2E_i^3 e^6)$. We combine this with the general Theorem 15,

$$(15) \quad \mathbb{P}(\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) \leq \text{Mcr}(G_L) - u) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{u^2}{4^3 B \text{Mcr}(G_L)}\right) + 4te^{-(\frac{1}{2}B)^{\frac{1}{3}}}$$

for $B \geq 2E_3^3 e^6$, because $\max E_i = E_3$ for δ_i sufficiently small. We set $B = \frac{1}{4^2} \left(\frac{u^2}{\text{Mcr}(G_L)}\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}$.

Theorem 16. For $u \geq 32^{2/3} (t(2\delta_i)^2 \pi M_{d-2}(W))^2 e^4 \sqrt{\text{Mcr}(G_L)}$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) \leq \text{Mcr}(G_L) - u) \leq (2 + 4t)e^{-\frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{u^2}{\text{Mcr}(G_L)}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}}.$$

Since the difference between median and expectation satisfies

$$\left| \frac{\text{Mcr}(G_L)}{\mathbb{E}\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)} - 1 \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\text{Var } \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)}}{\mathbb{E}\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)} = \mathcal{O}(t^{-\frac{1}{2}}),$$

we see that

$$(16) \quad \text{Mcr}(G_L) = t^4 \delta_i^{2d+2} I_W^{(2)}(L) + o(t^4 \delta_i^{2d+2}).$$

For the next theorem we set $u = \text{Mcr}(G_L) - c_1 t^4 \delta_i^{3d}$, and take into account that in our case $t\delta_i^d \geq c$, $d > 2$, and thus $t^4 \delta_i^{2d+2} \geq ct$.

Theorem 17. Let G_L be the projection of the RGG onto a two-dimensional plane L . Then there are $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that the random crossing number satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}(\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) \leq c_1 t^4 \delta_i^{3d}) \leq e^{-c_2 \sqrt[4]{t}}$$

for $t \geq 1$.

4.3. Projecting the RGG on a Random Plane. Until now, we fixed a plane L and computed the variance with respect to the random points V . In general, Theorem 12 and Theorem 13 allow to compute the expectation and variance with respect to V and the randomly chosen plane L . For the expectation we obtain from Theorem 12 and by Fubini's theorem

$$(17) \quad \mathbb{E}_{L,V} \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) = \frac{1}{8} c_d t^4 \delta_i^{2d+2} \int_{\mathcal{L}} I_W^{(2)}(L) dL + o(t^4 \delta_i^{2d+2}),$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and $\delta_i \rightarrow 0$, where dL denotes integration with respect to the Haar measure on \mathcal{L} . We use the variance decomposition $\text{Var}_{L,V} X = \mathbb{E}_L \text{Var}_V X + \text{Var}_L \mathbb{E}_V X$. By

$$(18) \quad \mathbb{E}_L \text{Var}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) = \frac{1}{8} c_d'' t^7 \delta_i^{4d+4} \int_{\mathcal{L}} I_W^{(3)}(L) dL + o(t^7 \delta_i^{4d+4}), \quad \text{and}$$

$$(19) \quad \text{Var}_L \mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) = \mathbb{E}_L (\mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L))^2 - (\mathbb{E}_{L,V} \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L))^2 = \\ \frac{1}{64} c_d^2 t^8 \delta_i^{4d+4} \left[\int_{\mathcal{L}} I_W^{(2)}(L)^2 dL - \left(\int_{\mathcal{L}} I_W^{(2)}(L) dL \right)^2 \right] + o(t^8 \delta_i^{4d+4})$$

we obtain

$$(20) \quad \text{Var}_{L,V} \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) = \frac{1}{64} c_d^2 t^8 \delta_i^{4d+4} \left[\int_{\mathcal{L}} I_W^{(2)}(L)^2 dL - \left(\int_{\mathcal{L}} I_W^{(2)}(L) dL \right)^2 \right] \\ + o(t^8 \delta_i^{4d+4}).$$

It is not a surprise that the variance $\text{Var}_{L,V} \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)$ is dominated by $\text{Var}_L \mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)$ in general. By Theorem 17, the crossing numbers are sharply concentrated around their mean which depends on L via $I_W^{(2)}(L)$. Hence the variance is just dominated by the variance of the random variable $I_W^{(2)}(L)$ for random $L \in \mathcal{L}$,

$$\text{Var}_L I_W^{(2)}(L) = \int_{\mathcal{L}} I_W^{(2)}(L)^2 dL - \left(\int_{\mathcal{L}} I_W^{(2)}(L) dL \right)^2$$

Hölder's inequality implies that this is positive as long as $I_W^{(2)}(L)$ is not a constant function.

Remark. The integral appearing in the expectation can be rewritten using integration over \mathcal{E}_{d-2}^d , the set of affine $(d-2)$ -dimensional planes with respect to the corresponding Haar measure, which gives

$$\int_{\mathcal{L}} I_W^{(2)}(L) dL = \int_{\mathcal{E}_{d-2}^d} \lambda_{d-2}(E \cap W)^2 dE.$$

It would be of interest to investigate the minimizers, resp. extremizers, of this integral with respect to W .

4.3.1. *The Rotation Invariant Case.* If W is the ball B of unit volume and thus V is *rotation invariant*, then $I_B^{(2)}(L) = I^{(2)}(B)$ is a constant function independent of L , and the leading term in (20) is vanishing. From (17) we see that in this case the expectation is independent of L .

$$\mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) = \mathbb{E}_L \mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) = t^4 \delta_t^{2d+2} I^{(2)}(B) + o(t^4 \delta_t^{2d+2})$$

For the variance this implies $\text{Var}_L \mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) = 0$, and hence

$$\text{Var}_{L,V} \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) = \mathbb{E}_L \text{Var}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) = \frac{1}{8} c_d'' t^7 \delta_t^{4d+4} I^{(3)}(B) + o(t^7 \delta_t^{4d+4}).$$

In this case the variance $\text{Var}_{L,V}$ is of the order t^{-1} —and thus surprisingly significantly—smaller than in the general case.

Theorem 18. *Let G_L be the projection of an RGG in the ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 3$, onto a two-dimensional uniformly chosen random plane L . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{L,V} \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) &= \frac{1}{8} c_d t^4 \delta_t^{2d+2} I^{(2)}(B) (1 + o(1)) \quad \text{and} \\ \text{Var}_{L,V} \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) &= \frac{1}{8} c_d'' t^7 \delta_t^{4d+4} I^{(3)}(B) (1 + o(1)), \end{aligned}$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Again, Chebychev's inequality immediately yields a law of large numbers which states that with high probability the crossing number of G_L in a random direction is very close to $\frac{1}{8} c_d t^4 \delta_t^{2d+2} I^{(2)}(B)$.

Corollary 19 (Law of Large Numbers). *Let G_L be the projection of an RGG in $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 3$, onto a random two-dimensional plane L . Then the normalized random crossing number converges in probability (with respect to the Poisson point process V and to L), as $t \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)}{t^4 \delta_t^{2d+2}} \rightarrow \frac{1}{8} c_d I^{(2)}(B).$$

4.3.2. *Deviation Inequalities.* To obtain a deviation inequality for fixed W and randomly chosen L and thus G_L , recall that by (16), and since $I_W^{(2)}(L)$ is bounded from below and above, there are constants $\underline{c}, \bar{c} > 0$ depending on W such that the median satisfies

$$\underline{c}t^4\delta_t^{2d+2} \leq \mathbb{M}\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) \leq \bar{c}t^4\delta_t^{2d+2}$$

for $t \geq 1$. Theorem 16 then tells us that for $u \geq 4\pi 32^{2/3}e^4 M_{d-2}(W)^2 \sqrt{\bar{c}} t^4 \delta_t^{d+3}$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) \leq \underline{c}t^4\delta_t^{2d+2} - u) \leq (2 + 4t)e^{-\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{u^2}{\bar{c}t^4\delta_t^{2d+2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}}.$$

For the next theorem choose some $c_1 > 0$. We set $u = \underline{c}t^4\delta_t^{2d+2} - c_1t^4\delta_t^{3d}$ which is positive for $t \geq T$, and take into account that in our case $t\delta_t^d \geq c$, $d > 2$, and thus $t^4\delta_t^{2d+2} \geq ct$.

Theorem 20. *Choose some $c_1 > 0$. Let G_L be the projection of the RGG onto a random two-dimensional plane L . Then the random crossing number satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}(\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) \leq c_1t^4\delta_t^{3d}) \leq e^{-c_2\sqrt[4]{t}}$$

for $t \geq T$ where c_2 and T depend on c_1 and W .

Hence it seems to be expensive to use the following computational naïve approach: try to minimize the crossing numbers by just projecting onto a sequence of random planes until reaching the theoretical minimum of order $\mathcal{O}(t^4\delta_t^{3d})$. This suggests to combine the search for an optimal choice of the direction of projection with other quantities of the RGG. It is a long standing assumption in graph drawing that there is a connection between the crossing number and the stress of a graph. Therefore the next section is devoted to investigations concerning the stress of RGGs.

5. THE STRESS OF AN RGG

According to (1) we define the stress of G_L as

$$\text{stress}(G, G_L) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in V_{\neq}^2} w(v_1, v_2)(d_0(v_1, v_2) - d_L(v_1, v_2))^2,$$

where $w(v_1, v_2)$ is a positive weight-function and d_0 resp. d_L are the distances between v_1 and v_2 , resp $v_1|_L$ and $v_2|_L$. As pointed out in the introduction, typically the weight function is unbounded for $v_2 \rightarrow v_1$ but the stress itself is bounded. We need in the following that stress is at least in L^2 , which for example is guaranteed if there exists an $s > 0$ such that

$$(21) \quad w(v_1, v_2)(d_0(v_1, v_2) - d_L(v_1, v_2))^2 \leq s$$

for all $v_1, v_2 \in W$. We will assume this throughout the paper. In the following theorem we use the notations

$$S_{W,L}^{(1)}(v) := \int_{W-v} w(0, v_2)(d_0(0, v_2) - d_L(0, v_2))^2 dv_2,$$

$$S_W^{(1)}(L) := \int_W S_{W,L}^{(1)}(v) dv, \quad \text{and} \quad S_W^{(2)}(L) := \int_W S_{W,L}^{(1)}(v)^2 dv.$$

Theorem 21. *Let G_L be the projection of the RGG in \mathbb{R}^d , $d \geq 3$, onto a two-dimensional plane L . Assume that $\text{stress}(G, G_L) \in L^2$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_V \text{stress}(G, G_L) = \frac{1}{2} t^2 S_W^{(1)}(L) \quad \text{and}$$

$$\text{Var}_V \text{stress}(G, G_L) = t^3 S_W^{(2)}(L) + \mathcal{O}(t^2),$$

Proof. As $\overline{\text{cr}}(G)$, stress is a U-statistic, but now of order two. Using the Slivnyak-Mecke formula, it is immediate that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_V \text{stress}(G, G_L) &= \frac{1}{2}t^2 \int_{W^2} w(v_1, v_2)(d_0(v_1, v_2) - d_L(v_1, v_2))^2 dv_1 dv_2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}t^2 \int_W \int_{W-v} w(0, v_2)(d_0(0, v_2) - d_L(0, v_2))^2 dv_2 dv.\end{aligned}$$

For the second moment we use $g(v_1, v_2) = w(v_1, v_2)(d_0(v_1, v_2) - d_L(v_1, v_2))^2$ as an abbreviation. Then the second moment is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_V \text{stress}(G, G_L)^2 = \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E}_V \sum_{\substack{(v_1, v_2) \in V_{\neq}^2 \\ (w_1, w_2) \in V_{\neq}^2}} g(v_1, v_2)g(w_1, w_2)$$

Similar to the discussion in the case of the crossing numbers, if both pairs are disjoint the expectation yields by the Slivnyak-Mecke formula $(\mathbb{E}_V \text{stress}(G, G_L))^2$. This implies that the variance is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}_V \text{stress}(G, G_L) &= \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E}_V \sum_{\substack{(v_1, v_2) \in V_{\neq}^2, (w_1, w_2) \in V_{\neq}^2 \\ |\{v_1, v_2\} \cap \{w_1, w_2\}| \geq 1}} g(v_1, v_2)g(w_1, w_2) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_V \sum_{(v, v_2, w_2) \in V_{\neq}^3} g(v, v_2)g(v, w_2) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_V \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in V_{\neq}^2} g(v_1, v_2)^2 \\ &= t^3 \int_W g(v, v_2)g(v, w_2) dv_2 dw_2 dv + \mathcal{O}(t^2) \\ &= t^3 S_W^{(2)}(L) + \mathcal{O}(t^2)\end{aligned}$$

□

The discussions from Section 4.2.2 and Section 4.3.1 lead to analogous results for the stress of the RGG. Because the standard deviation of the stress is smaller than the expectation by a factor $t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, the stress is concentrated around its mean. Using Chebychev's inequality we could derive a law of large numbers. Taking expectations with respect to a uniform plane L we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{L, V} \text{stress}(G, G_L) &= \frac{1}{2}t^2 \int_{\mathcal{L}} S_W^{(1)}(L) dL, \\ \text{Var}_{L, V} \text{stress}(G, G_L) &= \frac{1}{4}t^4 \left[\int_{\mathcal{L}} S_W^{(1)}(L)^2 dL - \left(\int_{\mathcal{L}} S_W^{(1)}(L) dL \right)^2 \right] + \mathcal{O}(t^3).\end{aligned}$$

Again, the term in brackets is only vanishing if $W = B$. In this case

$$\text{Var}_{L, V} \text{stress}(G, G_L) = \mathbb{E}_L \text{Var}_V \text{stress}(G, G_L) = \frac{1}{4}t^3 S_B^{(2)}(L) + \mathcal{O}(t^2).$$

6. CORRELATION BETWEEN CROSSING NUMBER AND STRESS

It seems to be widely conjectured that the crossing number and the stress should be positively correlated. Yet it also seems that a rigorous proof is still missing. It is the aim of this section to provide the first proof of this conjecture, in the case where the graph is a random geometric graph.

6.1. Projecting on a Fixed Plane. Clearly, by the definition of $\overline{\text{cr}}$ and stress we have

$$D_v \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) \geq 0 \text{ and } D_v \text{ stress}(G, G_L) \geq 0,$$

for all v and all realizations of V . Such a functional F satisfying $D_v(F) \geq 0$ is called increasing. The Harris-FKG inequality for Poisson point processes [23] links this fact to the correlation of $\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L)$ and $\text{stress}(G, G_L)$.

Theorem 22. *Assume that $\text{stress}(G, G_L) \in L^2$. Because stress and $\overline{\text{cr}}$ are increasing, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) \text{stress}(G, G_L) \geq \mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) \mathbb{E}_V \text{stress}(G, G_L),$$

and thus the correlation is positive.

We immediately obtain that the covariance is positive and is of order at most

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}_V(\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L), \text{stress}(G_L)) &\leq \sqrt{\text{Var}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) \text{Var}_V \text{stress}(G, G_L)} \\ &= \mathcal{O}(t^5 \delta_t^{2d+2}) \end{aligned}$$

The following theorem proves that this is indeed the correct order.

Theorem 23. *Let G_L be the projection of an RGG in \mathbb{R}^d , $d \geq 3$, onto a two-dimensional plane L . Assume as in (21) that the stress is bounded. Then*

$$\text{Cov}_V(\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L), \text{stress}(G, G_L)) = \frac{1}{2} c_d t^5 \delta_t^{2d+2} \int_W \lambda_{d-2}((v + L^\perp) \cap W) S_{W,L}^{(1)}(v) dv (1 + o(1))$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. We again use the abbreviations $g(v_1, v_2) = w(v_1, v_2)(d_0(v_1, v_2) - d_L(v_1, v_2))^2$ and $f(v_1, \dots, v_4) = \mathbb{1}([v_1, v_2]_L \cap [v_3, v_4]_L \neq \emptyset, \|v_1 - v_2\| \leq \delta_t, \|v_3 - v_4\| \leq \delta_t)$. The covariance is given by

$$\text{Cov}_V(\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L), \text{stress}(G, G_L)) = \frac{1}{16} \mathbb{E}_V \sum_{\substack{(v_1, \dots, v_4) \in V_\neq^4, (w_1, w_2) \in V_\neq^2 \\ |\{v_1, \dots, v_4\} \cap \{w_1, w_2\}| \geq 1}} f(v_1, \dots, v_4) g(w_1, w_2)$$

since the terms where (v_1, \dots, v_4) is disjoint from (w_1, w_2) by the Slivnyak-Mecke formula yield $\mathbb{E}_V \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) \mathbb{E}_V \text{stress}(G, G_L)$. In the case when both terms have one point in common we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{16} \mathbb{E}_V \sum_{\substack{(v_1, \dots, v_4) \in V_\neq^4, (w_1, w_2) \in V_\neq^2 \\ |\{v_1, \dots, v_4\} \cap \{w_1, w_2\}| = 1}} f(v_1, \dots, v_4) g(w_1, w_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_V \sum_{(v, v_2, \dots, v_4, w_2) \in V_\neq^5} f(v, v_1, \dots, v_4) g(v, w_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} t^5 \int_W I_{W,L}^{(1)}(v) S_{W,L}^{(1)}(v) dv \\ &= \frac{1}{2} c_d t^5 \delta_t^{2d+2} \int_W \lambda_{d-2}((v + L^\perp) \cap W) S_{W,L}^{(1)}(v) dv (1 + o(1)) \end{aligned}$$

by Proposition 9. For the terms where $w_1, w_2 \in \{v_1, \dots, v_4\}$ we use that by assumption (21) the stress is bounded by some $s > 0$. The Slivnyak-Mecke formula gives

$$\frac{1}{16} \mathbb{E}_V \sum_{\substack{(v_1, \dots, v_4) \in V_\#^4 \\ \{w_1, w_2\} \subset \{v_1, \dots, v_4\}}} f(v_1, \dots, v_4) g(w_1, w_2) \leq \frac{s}{4} \mathbb{E} \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) = \mathcal{O}(t^4 \delta_t^{2d+2}).$$

□

As an immediate consequence we see that the correlation coefficient between the crossing numbers and the stress is bounded away from zero and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{Corr}_V(\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L), \text{stress}(G, G_L)) \\ = \frac{c_d \int_W \lambda_{d-2}((v + L^\perp) \cap W) S_{W,L}^{(1)}(v) dv}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} c_d'' I_W^{(3)}(L) S_W^{(2)}(L)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that by Hölder's inequality we always have

$$\int_W \lambda_{d-2}((v + L^\perp) \cap W) S_{W,L}^{(1)}(v) dv < \sqrt{I_W^{(3)}(L) S_W^{(2)}(L)}$$

and thus the correlation coefficient is bounded away from one.

6.2. Projecting on a Random Plane. The bounds for the covariance in the Poisson point process V given above can be used to compute covariance bounds in L and V when L is not fixed but random. For the sake of simplicity we concentrate on the rotation invariant case when $W = B$. As an immediate consequence of Theorem 23 we obtain

Corollary 24. *Let G_L be the projection of an RGG in $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 3$, onto a two-dimensional random plane L . Note that by rotation invariance we have $I_B^{(3)}(L) = I^{(3)}(B)$ and $S_B^{(2)}(L) = S^{(2)}(B)$. Then the correlation between the crossing number and the stress of the RGG is positive with*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{Corr}_V(\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L), \text{stress}(G, G_L)) = \frac{c_d \int_B \lambda_{d-2}((v + L^\perp) \cap B) S_{B,L}^{(1)}(v) dv}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} c_d'' I^{(3)}(B) S^{(2)}(B)}}$$

In particular, the correlation does not vanish as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This gives the first proof we are aware of, that there is a strict positive correlation between the crossing number and the stress of a graph. Hence, at least for rotation invariant RGGs, the method to optimize the stress to obtain good crossing numbers can be supported by rigorous mathematics.

7. BINOMIAL INPUT

Up until now, we preferred to work within the setting of a Poisson point process because of the strong mathematical tools that are available in this case. However, it is straightforward that the above questions can similarly be investigated in the binomial setting. As an example we work this out for the computation of the expected crossing numbers in Theorem 12.

Let V_n be a set of n random points uniformly chosen in W . Define the graph G by putting an edge between two points if their distance is bounded by δ_n . Here, according to the definitions in Section 3, we assume that we are either in the thermodynamic or in the dense regime, which means $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \delta_n^n = c > 0$ or $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \delta_n^d = \infty$.

We compute the expectation of the rectilinear crossing numbers when projecting on a plane L , and use the notation $n_{(k)} = n \dots (n - k + 1)$. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{V_n} \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) \\
&= \frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E} \sum_{(v_1, \dots, v_4) \in V_{n, \neq}^4} \mathbb{1}([v_1, v_2]_L \cap [v_3, v_4]_L \neq \emptyset) \mathbb{1}(\|v_1 - v_2\| \leq \delta_n, \|v_3 - v_4\| \leq \delta_n) \\
&= \frac{n_{(4)}}{8} \int_{W^4} \mathbb{1}([v_1, v_2]_L \cap [v_3, v_4]_L \neq \emptyset) \mathbb{1}(\|v_1 - v_2\| \leq \delta_t, \|v_3 - v_4\| \leq \delta_t) dv_1 \dots dv_4 \\
&= \frac{n_{(4)}}{8} \int_W I_{W, L}^{(1)}(v_1) dv_1 \\
&= \frac{n^4}{8} \delta_n^{2d+2} c_d I_W^{(2)}(L) (1 + o(1))
\end{aligned}$$

applying Proposition 9 in the last step. This is the analogue to Theorem 12 in the binomial setting. The analogue to (17) would be

$$\mathbb{E}_{L, V_n} \overline{\text{cr}}(G_L) = \frac{n^4}{8} \delta_n^{2d+2} c_d \int_{\mathcal{L}} I_W^{(2)}(L) dL (1 + o(1)).$$

We leave further computations to the interested reader.

8. CONCLUSION

Apart from providing precise asymptotics for the crossing numbers of drawings of random geometric graphs, the main findings are the positive covariance and the non-vanishing correlation between the stress and the crossing number of the drawing of a random geometric graph. Of interest would be whether $\text{Cov}_L(\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L), \text{stress}(G, G_L)) > 0$ for arbitrary graphs G . There are simple examples of graphs G where this is wrong. However, we could ask in a slightly weaker form whether at least $\mathbb{E}_V \text{Cov}_L(\overline{\text{cr}}(G_L), \text{stress}(G_L)) > 0$, but we have not been able to prove that.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aigner, M., Ziegler, G.M.: Proofs from THE BOOK. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 4th edn. (2009)
- [2] Ajtai, M., Chvátal, V., Newborn, M., Szemerédi, E.: Crossing-free subgraphs. In: Theory and Practice of Combinatorics, North-Holland Mathematics Studies, vol. 60, pp. 9–12. North-Holland (1982)
- [3] Biedl, T.C., Chimani, M., Derka, M., Mutzel, P.: Crossing number for graphs with bounded pathwidth. In: ISAAC 2017. pp. 13:1–13:13. LIPIcs (2017)
- [4] Bienstock, D.: Some provably hard crossing number problems. Discrete Comput. Geom. **6**, 443–459 (1991)
- [5] Brandes, U., Pich, C.: An experimental study on distance-based graph drawing. In: GD 2008. pp. 218–229. LNCS 5417, Springer (2008)
- [6] Cabello, S.: Hardness of approximation for crossing number. Discrete & Computational Geometry **49**, 348–358 (2013)
- [7] Cabello, S., Mohar, B.: Crossing number and weighted crossing number of near-planar graphs. Algorithmica **60**(3), 484–504 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-009-9357-5>
- [8] Chimani, M., Eades, P., Eades, P., Hong, S.H., Huang, W., Klein, K., Marner, M., Smith, R., Thomas, B.: People prefer less stress and fewer crossings. In: GD 2014. pp. 523–524. LNCS 8871, Springer (2014)
- [9] Chimani, M., Hliněný, P.: A tighter insertion-based approximation of the crossing number. Journal of Combinatorial Optimization pp. 1–43 (2016)
- [10] Chimani, M., Hliněný, P.: Inserting multiple edges into a planar graph. In: SoCG 2016. pp. 30:1–30:15. LIPIcs (2016)
- [11] Chimani, M., Hliněný, P., Mutzel, P.: Vertex insertion approximates the crossing number for apex graphs. European Journal of Combinatorics **33**, 326–335 (2012)
- [12] Chuzhoy, J.: An algorithm for the graph crossing number problem. In: STOC '11. pp. 303–312. ACM (2011)
- [13] Fox, J., Pach, J., Suk, A.: Approximating the rectilinear crossing number. In: GD 2016. pp. 413–426. LNCS 9801, Springer (2016)
- [14] Garey, M.R., Johnson, D.S.: Crossing number is NP-complete. SIAM J. on Algebraic and Discrete Methods **4**, 312–316 (1983)
- [15] Gitler, I., Hliněný, P., nos, J.L., Salazar, G.: The crossing number of a projective graph is quadratic in the face-width. Electronic Journal of Combinatorics **29**, 219–233 (2007)
- [16] Hliněný, P., Chimani, M.: Approximating the crossing number of graphs embeddable in any orientable surface. In: SODA '10. pp. 918–927 (2010)
- [17] Hliněný, P., Salazar, G.: Approximating the crossing number of toroidal graphs. In: ISAAC '07. pp. 148–159. LNCS 4835, Springer (2007)
- [18] de Klerk, E., Maharry, J., Pasechnik, D.V., Richter, R.B., Salazar, G.: Improved bounds for the crossing numbers of $K_{m,n}$ and K_n . SIAM J. Discr. Math. **20**(1), 189–202 (2006)
- [19] Klimenta, M., Brandes, U.: Graph drawing by classical multidimensional scaling: New perspectives. In: GD 2012. pp. 55–66. LNCS 7704, Springer (2013)
- [20] Kobourov, S.G.: Force-directed drawing algorithms. In: Handbook of Graph Drawing and Visualization, pp. 383–408. CRC Press (2013)
- [21] Kobourov, S.G., Pupyrev, S., Saket, B.: Are crossings important for drawing large graphs? In: GD 2014. pp. 234–245. LNCS 8871, Springer (2014)
- [22] Lachieze-Rey, R., Reitzner, M.: U-statistics in stochastic geometry. In: Peccati, G., Reitzner, M. (eds.) Stochastic Analysis for Poisson Point Processes. pp. 229–253. Bocconi & Springer Series 7, Bocconi University Press, Springer (2016)
- [23] Last, G., Penrose, M.: Fock space representation, chaos expansion and covariance, inequalities for general Poisson processes. Probab. Th. Rel. Fields **150**, 663–690 (2011)
- [24] Leighton, F.T.: Complexity Issues in VLSI: Optimal Layouts for the Shuffle-exchange Graph and Other Networks. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA (1983)
- [25] Peccati, G., Reitzner, M. (eds.): Stochastic Analysis for Poisson Point Processes: Malliavin Calculus, Wiener-Itô Chaos Expansions and Stochastic Geometry. Bocconi & Springer Series 7, Bocconi University Press, Springer, Milan (2016)
- [26] Penrose, M.: Random Geometric Graphs. Oxford Studies in Probability (2004)
- [27] Reitzner, M.: Poisson point processes: Large deviation inequalities for the convex distance. Electron. Commun. Probab. **18**, 1–7 (2013)
- [28] Reitzner, M., Schulte, M.: Central limit theorems for U-statistics of Poisson point processes. Ann. Probab. **41**, 3879–3909 (2013)
- [29] Reitzner, M., Schulte, M., Thäle, C.: Limit theory for the Gilbert graph. Adv. Appl. Math. **88**, 26–61 (2017)
- [30] Schaefer, M.: Crossing Numbers of Graphs. CRC-Press (2017)
- [31] Schneider, R., Weil, W.: Stochastic and Integral Geometry. Probability and Its Applications, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg (2008)

THEORETICAL CS, INSTITUTE OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNI OSNABRÜCK, GERMANY

E-mail address: `markus.chimani@uni-osnabrueck.de`

URL: `https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4681-5550`

STOCHASTICS, INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNI OSNABRÜCK, GERMANY

E-mail address: `hanna.doering@uni-osnabrueck.de`

STOCHASTICS, INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNI OSNABRÜCK, GERMANY

E-mail address: `matthias.reitzner@uni-osnabrueck.de`