

Finding large matchings in 1-planar graphs of minimum degree 3

Therese Biedl ^{*} Fabian Klute [†]

Abstract

A *matching* is a set of edges without common endpoint. It was recently shown that every *1-planar graph* (i.e., graphs that can be drawn in the plane with at most one crossing per edge) that has minimum degree 3 has a matching of size at least $\frac{n+12}{7}$, and this is tight for some graphs. The proof did not come with an algorithm to find the matching more efficiently than a general-purpose maximum-matching algorithm. In this paper, we give such an algorithm. More generally, we show that any matching that has no augmenting paths of length 9 or less has size at least $\frac{n+12}{7}$ in a 1-planar graph with minimum degree 3.

1 Introduction

The *matching problem* (i.e., finding a large set of edges in a graph such that no two chosen edges have a common endpoint) is one of the oldest problem in graph theory and graph algorithms, see for example [3, 18] for overviews.

To find the maximum matching in a graph $G = (V, E)$, the fastest algorithm is the one by Hopcroft and Karp if G is bipartite [16], and the one by Micali and Vazirani otherwise ([19], see also [24] for further clarifications). As pointed out in [24], for a graph with n vertices and m edges the run-time of the algorithm by Micali and Vazirani is $O(m\sqrt{n})$ in the RAM model and $O(m\sqrt{n}\alpha(m, n))$ in the pointer model, where $\alpha(\cdot)$ is the inverse Ackerman function. For *planar graphs* (graphs that can be drawn without crossing in the plane) there exists a linear-time approximation scheme for maximum matching [1], and it can easily be generalized to so-called *H*-minor-free graphs [9] and *k*-planar graphs [13].

For many graph classes, specialized results concerning matchings and matching algorithms have been found. To name just a few, every bipartite d -regular graph has a *perfect matching* (a matching of size $n/2$) [14] and it can be found in $O(m \log d)$ time [8]. Every 3-regular biconnected graph has a perfect matching [21] and it can be found in linear time

^{*}David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 1A2, Canada. Supported by NSERC. biedl@uwaterloo.ca

[†]Algorithms and Complexity Group, TU Wien, Austria, fkolute@ac.tuwien.ac.at. Research initiated while the author was visiting the University of Waterloo.

for planar graphs and in near-linear time for arbitrary graphs [4]. Every graph with a Hamiltonian path has a *near-perfect matching* (of size $\lceil (n-1)/2 \rceil$); this includes for example the 4-connected planar graphs [23] for which the Hamiltonian path (and with it the near-perfect matching) can be found in linear time [7].

For graphs that do not have perfect or near-perfect matchings, one possible avenue of exploration is to ask for guarantees on the size of matchings. One of the first results in this direction is due to Nishizeki and Baybars [20], who showed that every planar graph with minimum degree 3 has a matching of size at least $\frac{n+4}{3}$. (This bound is tight for some planar graphs with minimum degree 3.) The proof relies on the Tutte-Berge theorem and does not give an algorithm to find such a matching (or at least, none faster than any maximum-matching algorithm). Over 30 years later, a linear-time algorithm to find a matching of this size in planar graphs of minimum degree 3 was finally developed by Franke, Rutter and Wagner [12]. The latter paper was a major inspiration for our current work.

In recent years, there has been much interest in *near-planar* graphs, i.e., graphs that may be required to have crossings but that are “close” to planar graphs in some sense. We are interested here in *1-planar graphs*, which are those that can be drawn with at most one crossing per edge. (Detailed definitions can be found in Section 2.) See a recent annotated bibliography [17] for an overview of many results known for 1-planar graphs. The first author and Wittnebel [5] gave matching-bounds for 1-planar graphs of varying minimum degrees, and showed that any 1-planar graph with minimum degree 3 has a matching of size at least $\frac{n+12}{7}$. (Again, this bound is tight for some 1-planar graphs with minimum degree 3.)

The proof in [5] is again via the Tutte-Berge algorithm and does not give rise to a fast algorithm to find a matching of this size. This is the topic of the current paper. We give an algorithm that finds, for any 1-planar graph with minimum degree 3, a matching of size at least $\frac{n+12}{7}$ in linear time in the RAM model and time $O(n\alpha(n))$ in the pointer-model. The algorithm consists simply of running the algorithm by Micali and Vazirani for a limited number of rounds (and in particular, does not require that a 1-planar drawing of the graph is given). The bulk of the work consists of the analysis, which states that if there are no augmenting paths of length 9 or less, then the matching has the desired size for graphs with minimum degree 3. Along the way, we also prove some bounds obtained for graphs with higher minimum degree, though these are not tight.

The paper is structured as follows. After reviewing some background in Section 2, we state the algorithm in Section 3. The analysis proceeds in multiple steps in Section 4. We first delete short flowers from the graph (and account for free vertices in them directly). The remaining graph is basically bipartite, and we can use bounds known for independent sets in 1-planar graphs to obtain matching-bounds that are very close to the desired goal. Closing this gap requires a non-trivial modification of the graph and argument; this is deferred to Section 5 before we conclude in Section 6.

2 Background

We assume familiarity with graphs and graph algorithms, see for example [10] and [22]. Throughout the paper, G is a simple graph with n vertices and m edges. A *matching* is a set M of edges without common endpoints; we say that $e = (x, y) \in M$ is *matched* and x and y are *matching-partners*. $V(M)$ denotes the endpoints of edges in M ; we call $v \in V(M)$ *matched* and all other vertices *free*. An *alternating walk* is a walk that alternates between unmatched and matched edges. An *augmenting path* is an alternating walk that repeats no vertices and begins and ends at a free vertex; we use *k-augmenting path* for an augmenting path with at most k edges. Note that if P is an augmenting path of M (and viewed as an edge-set), then $(M \setminus P) \cup (P \setminus M)$ is also a matching and has one more edge.

A *drawing* Γ of a graph consists of assigning points in \mathbb{R}^2 to vertices and simple curves to each edge such that curves of edges end at the points of its endpoints. We usually identify the graph-theoretic object (vertex, edge) with the geometric object (point, curve) that it has been assigned to. We only consider *good* drawings (see [22] for details) that avoid degeneracies such as an edge going through the point of a non-incident vertex or two edges with a common endpoint intersecting. The connected regions of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Gamma$ are called the *regions* of the drawing.

A *crossing* c of Γ is a pair of two edges (v, w) and (x, y) that have a point in their interior in common. A *crossed* edge is one that has a crossing on it; otherwise it is called *uncrossed*. A drawing Γ is called *k-planar* (or *planar* for $k = 0$) if every edge has at most k crossings. A graph is called *k-planar* if it has a k -planar drawing. While planarity can be tested in linear time [15, 6], testing 1-planarity is NP-hard [13].

Fix a 1-planar drawing Γ and consider a crossing c between edges (v_0, v_2) and (v_1, v_3) . Then we could draw edge (v_i, v_{i+1}) (for $i = 0, \dots, 3$ and addition modulo 4) without crossing by walking “very close” to crossing c . We call the pair (v_i, v_{i+1}) a *potential kite-edge* and note that if we inserted (v_i, v_{i+1}) in the aforementioned manner, then it would be consecutive with the crossing edges in the cyclic orders of edges around v_i and v_{i+1} in Γ .

3 Finding the matching

Our algorithm to find a large matching is a one-liner: repeatedly extend the matching via 9-augmenting paths (i.e., of length at most 9) until there are no more such paths.

Note that the algorithm does not depend on the knowledge that the graph is 1-planar and does not require having a 1-planar drawing at hand. It could be executed on any graph; our contribution is to show (in the next section) that if it is executed on a 1-planar graph G with minimum degree 3 then the resulting matching has size at least $\frac{n+12}{7}$.

Running time Finding a matching M in G such that there is no k -augmenting path can be done in time $O(k|E|)$ using the algorithm by Micali and Vazirani [19]. (We state all run-time bounds here in the RAM model; for the pointer model add a factor of $\alpha(|E|, |V|)$.) This algorithm runs in phases, each of which has a running time of $O(|E|)$ and increases the length of the minimum-length augmenting path by at least two. See for example the

paper by Bast et al. [2] for a more detailed explanation. Since for 1-planar graphs we have $|E| \in O(|V|)$ we get a linear time algorithm in the number of vertices of G to find a matching without 9-augmenting paths.

4 Analysis

Assume that M is a matching without augmenting paths of length at most 9, and let F be the free vertices; $|F| = n - 2|M|$. To analyze the size of M , we proceed in three stages. First we remove some vertices and matching-edges that belong to short flowers (defined below); these are “easy” to account for. Next we split the remaining vertices by their distance (measured along alternating paths) to free vertices. Since short flowers have been removed, no edges can exist between vertices of even small distance; they hence form an independent set. Using a crucial lemma from [5] on the size of independent sets in 1-planar graphs, this shows that $|M| \geq \frac{7}{50}(n + 12)$, which is very close to the desired bound of $\frac{n+12}{7}$. The last stage (which does the improvement from $\frac{7}{50}$ to $\frac{1}{7}$) will require non-trivial effort and is done mostly out of academic interest; this is deferred to Section 5.

Flowers A *flower*¹ is an alternating walk that begins and ends at the same free vertex; we write *k-flower* for a flower with at most k edges. We only consider 7-flowers; Figure 1 illustrates all possible such flowers. Note that such short flowers split into a path (called *stem*) and an odd cycle (the *blossom*); we call a flower a *cycle-flower* if the stem is empty.




Figure 1: All possible flowers of length up to 7. Unmatched vertices are white, matched edges are thick.

Let V_C (the “ C ” reminds of “cycle”) be all vertices that belong to a 7-cycle-flower and let M_C and F_C be all matching-edges and free vertices within V_C .

Claim 1. $|F_C| \leq |M_C|$.

Proof. For every $f \in F_C$ there exists some 7-cycle-flower $f-v_1-v_2-\dots-v_k-f$ with $k \in \{2, 4, 6\}$. Assign f to matching-edge $(v_1, v_2) \in M_C$. Assume for contradiction that another vertex $f' \in F_C$ was also assigned to (v_1, v_2) . Then f' is adjacent to one of v_1, v_2 . If it is v_2 , then

¹Our terminology follows the one in Edmonds’ famous blossom-algorithm [11].

$f'-v_2-v_1-f$ is a 3-augmenting path. If it is v_1 , then $f'-v_1-\dots-v_k-f$ is a 7-augmenting path, see Figure 2(a). \square

From now on we will only study the graph $G \setminus V_C$. Let F_B (the “ B ” reminds of “blossom”) be all those free vertices f that are not in F_C and that belong to a 7-flower. By $f \notin F_C$ this flower has a non-empty stem, which is possible only if its length is exactly 7 and the stem has two edges $f-s-t$ while the blossom is a 3-cycle $t-x_0-x_1-t$. Furthermore (s, t) and (x_0, x_1) are matching-edges. Let M_B be the set of such matching-edges (x_0, x_1) i.e., matching-edges that belong to the blossom of such a 7-flower. Note that we do *not* include the matching-edge (s, t) in M_B (unless it belongs to a different 7-flower where it is in the blossom). Let T_B be the set of such vertices t , i.e., vertices that belong to a 7-flower and belong to both the stem and the blossom. Set $V_B = T_B \cup V(M_B)$.

Claim 2. $|T_B| \leq |M_B|$.

Proof. Assign each $t \in T_B$ to a matching-edge $(x_0, x_1) \in M_B$ that is within the same blossom of some 7-flower of $G \setminus V_C$. Assume for contradiction that some other vertex $t' \in T_B$ is also assigned to (x_0, x_1) . Let $t-s-f$ and $t'-s'-f'$ be the stems of the 7-flowers containing t and t' , and note that $s \neq s'$ since they are matching-partners of $t \neq t'$. This gives an alternating path $f-s-t-x_0-x_1-t'-s'-f'$, see Figure 2(b). Depending on whether $f = f'$ this is a 7-augmenting path or 7-cycle-flower; the former contradicts the choice of M and the latter that $(x_0, x_1) \notin M_C$. \square




Figure 2: Augmenting paths found in the proofs of (a) Claim 1 and (b) Claim 2.

The auxiliary graph H For any vertex v , let the *distance to a free vertex* be the number of edges in a shortest alternating path from a free vertex to v . Let D_k be the vertices of distance k to a free vertex, and observe that there are no edges from D_0 to D_3 , else there would be a shorter alternating path. We consider these sets as they are found in the graph $G \setminus V_C \setminus V_B$.

Observation 1. In graph $G \setminus V_C \setminus V_B$, there are no matching-edges within D_k for $k = 1$ and $k = 3$, and no edges at all within D_k for $k = 0$ and $k = 2$.

Proof. If there was such an edge (v, v') , then it, together with the alternating paths of length k that lead from free vertices to v, v' , form a 7-augmenting path or a 7-flower. \square

From now on, we will only study the subgraph H induced by $D_0 \cup \dots \cup D_3$, noting again that this does *not* include the vertices in $V_C \cup V_B$. For ease of referring to them, we rename the vertices of H as follows (see also Figure 3):

- $F_H = F \setminus F_C = D_0$ are the free vertices in H .
- $S = D_1$ are the vertices adjacent to free vertices in H .
- $T_H = D_2$ are the vertices in H that have matching-partners in S and are not in S .
- $U = D_3$ are the vertices in H that are adjacent to T_H and not in $F \cup S \cup T_H$.




Figure 3: Illustration of the partitioning of edges and vertices. The free vertices $F = F_C \cup F_H$, the matching edges $M = M_C \cup M_S \cup M_U$, and the remaining vertices $S \cup T_H \cup U$ in H .

The following shortcuts will be convenient. For any vertex sets A, B , an A -vertex is a vertex in A , an A -neighbour is a neighbour of a vertex in A , and an AB -edge is an edge connecting a vertex in A with a vertex in B . Using Observation 1 and the definition of V_C (which includes the *entire* flower) and V_B (which includes *both* ends of the matching-edge) one easily verifies the following:

Observation 2. • *There are no matching-edges within S or within U .*

- *There are no edges within F_H or within T_H .*
- *The matching-partner of an S -vertex is in $T_H \cup T_B$.*
- *The matching-partner of a U -vertex is not in H .*
- *All neighbours of an F_H -vertex belong to S or are not in H .*




Figure 4: Augmenting paths found in the proofs of (a) Lemma 1, $t \in T_H$ has a neighbour in V_C . (b) Lemma 1, $t \in T_H$ has a neighbour in V_B .

- All neighbours of a T_H -vertex belong to $S \cup U$ or are not in H .

Let M_S be the set of matching-edges incident to S . Let M_U be the matching-edges incident to U . Since there are no matching-edges within S or U , we have $|M_S| = |S|$ and $|U| = |M_U|$.

We stated earlier that any neighbour of F_H is either in S or not in H . The latter is actually impossible (though this is non-trivial), and likewise for T_H .

Lemma 1. *No vertex in $F_H \cup T_H$ has a neighbour in G that is outside H .*

Proof. First observe that no edge can connect a vertex in $F_H \cup T_H = D_0 \cup D_2$ with a vertex $z \in D_k$ for $k \geq 4$ since z would have been added to $D_1 = S$ or $D_3 = U$ instead. So we must only show that no vertex in $F_H \cup T_H$ has a neighbour in $V_C \cup V_B$. We show the claim only for $t \in T_H$; the proof is similar (and even easier) for $f \in F_H$ by replacing the path $t-s-f$ defined below with just f .

Figure 4(a) illustrates the following. Fix some $t \in T_H$, let $s \in S$ be its matching-partner and let $f \in F_H$ be an arbitrary free vertex incident to s . Assume for contradiction that t has a neighbour v_i in V_C , so v_i belongs to some 7-cycle-flower $v_0-v_1-\dots-v_k-v_0$ where $k \in \{2, 4, 6\}$ and $v_0 \in F$. Note that $v_0 \neq f$ since $v_0 \in F_C$ while $f \in F_H$. If i is odd then $f-s-t-v_i-\dots-v_k-v_0$ is a 9-augmenting path, and if i is even then $f-s-t-v_i-v_{i-1}-\dots-v_1-v_0$ is a 9-augmenting path; both are impossible.

Now consider some $(x_0, x_1) \in M_B$ that belongs to a 7-flower $f'-s'-t'-x_0-x_1-t'-s'-f'$ where (s', t') is a matching-edge and $t' \in T_B$. Note that $t' \neq t$ (hence $s' \neq s$) since $t' \in T_B$ while $t \in T_H$. If t and t' are adjacent, then $f-s-t-t'-s'-f'$ is a 5-augmenting path or a 5-cycle-flower. If t and x_i are adjacent for $i \in \{0, 1\}$, then $f-s-t-x_i-x_{1-i}-t'-s'-f'$ is a 7-augmenting path or 7-cycle-flower. See Figure 4(b). There cannot be such augmenting paths, and no such cycle-flowers either since $t \notin T_C$. \square

In particular, if a vertex in $F_H \cup T_H$ had degree d in G , then it also has degree d in H ; this will be important in obtaining matching-bounds below.

Minimum degree 3 With this, we can prove our first matching-bound. We need the following lemma shown by Biedl and Wittnebel:

Lemma 2 ([5]). *Let G be a simple 1-planar graph. Let A be a non-empty independent set of G where all vertices in A have degree 3 or more in G . Let A_d be the vertices of degree d in A . Then*

$$2|A_3| + \sum_{d>3} (3d - 6)|A_d| \leq 12|V \setminus A| - 24.$$

Lemma 3. *We have (i) $|F_H| \leq 6|S| - 12$ and (ii) $|F_H| + |T_H| \leq 6|S| + 6|U| - 12$.*

Proof. Consider first the subgraph of H induced by F_H and S . By Observation 2 and Lemma 1 any vertex in F_H has degree at least 3 in this subgraph, and they form an independent set. Consider the inequality of Lemma 2. Any vertex in F_H contributes at least 2 units to the LHS while the RHS is $12|S| - 24$. This proves claim (i) after dividing.

Now consider the subgraph of H induced by $F_H \cup T_H$ and $S \cup U$. By Observation 2 and Lemma 1 any vertex in $F_H \cup T_H$ has degree at least 3 in this subgraph, and they form an independent set. Claim (ii) now follows from Lemma 2 as above. \square

Corollary 1. *If the minimum degree is 3, then $|M| \geq \frac{7}{50}(n + 12)$.*

Proof. Adding the right claim from Lemma 3 six times to the left one gives

$$7|F_H| + 6|T_H| \leq 42|S| + 36|U| - 84 \leq 42|M_S| + 36|M_U| - 84.$$

Adding Claim 1 seven times and Claim 2 six times gives

$$7|F_C| + 7|F_H| + 6|T_B| + 6|T_H| \leq 42|M_S| + 36|M_U| + 7|M_C| + 6|M_B| - 84.$$

Since $|S| = |M_S| = |T_H| + |T_B|$, this simplifies to

$$7|F| = 7|F_H| + 7|F_C| \leq 36|M_S| + 36|M_U| + 7|M_C| + 6|M_B| - 84 \leq 36|M| - 84.$$

Therefore $2|M| = n - |F| \geq n + 12 - \frac{36}{7}|M|$ which gives the bound after rearranging. \square

It is worth pointing out that this result (as well as Theorem 2 below) does not use 1-planarity of the graph except when using the bound in Lemma 2. Hence, similar bounds could be proved for any graph class where the size of independent sets can be upper-bounded relative to its minimum degree.

Doing the improvement from $\frac{7}{50}$ to $\frac{1}{7}$ will be done by improving the bound on $|F_H| + |T_H|$ slightly. By modifying H and its 1-planar drawing and studying a resulting 1-planar bipartite graph J , we will show the following in Section 5:

Lemma 4. $|F| \leq 2|M_C| + 2|M_B| + 5|M_S| + 4|M_U| - 12 \leq 5|M| - 12$.

This then gives our main result:

Theorem 1. *Let G be a 1-planar graph with minimum degree 3, and let M be a matching in G that has no augmenting path of length 9 or less. Then $|M| \geq \frac{n+12}{7}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4 we have $2|M| = n - |F| \geq n - 5|M| + 12$ or $7|M| \geq n + 12$. \square

Higher minimum degree Since the bound for independent sets in 1-planar graphs gets smaller when the minimum degree is larger, we can prove better matching-bounds for higher minimum degree.

Lemma 5. *If the minimum degree is $\delta > 3$, then*

$$|F_H| \leq \frac{4}{\delta-2}(|S| - 2) \quad \text{and} \quad |F_H| + |T_H| \leq \frac{4}{\delta-2}(|S| + |U| - 2).$$

Proof. As in Lemma 3, consider the subgraph of H induced by F_H and S . Any $f \in F_H$ has degree δ or more and contributes at least $3\delta - 6$ units to the LHS of the inequality in Lemma 2. The RHS is $12|S| - 24$. This proves the left claim after dividing. The right claim is proved the same way using the subgraph induced by $F_H \cup T_H$ and $S \cup U$. \square

Theorem 2. *Let G be a 1-planar graph with minimum degree δ . Let M be any matching in G without 9-augmenting path. Then*

- $|M| \geq \frac{3}{10}(n + 12)$ for $\delta = 4$,
- $|M| \geq \frac{1}{3}(n + 12)$ for $\delta \geq 5$.

Proof. Set $c = \frac{4}{\delta-2}$, so $|F_H| \leq c(|S| - 12)$ and $|F_H| + |T_H| \leq c(|S| + |U| - 12)$. Taking the former inequality once and adding the latter one c times gives

$$(c + 1)|F_H| + c|T_H| \leq (c^2 + c)|S| + c^2|U| - (c + 1)12 = (c^2 + c)|M_S| + c^2|M_U| - (c + 1)12.$$

Adding Claim 1 $c + 1$ times and Claim 2 c times gives

$$(c+1)(|F_C| + |F_H|) + c(|T_B| + |T_H|) \leq (c^2 + c)|M_S| + c^2|M_U| + (c+1)|M_C| + c|M_B| - (c+1)12. \quad (1)$$

For $\delta = 4$ we have $c = 2$, and with $|T_B| + |T_H| = |M_S|$ Equation 1 simplifies to

$$3|F| \leq 4|M_S| + 4|M_U| + 3|M_C| + 2|M_B| - 36 \leq 4|M| - 36.$$

Therefore $2|M| = n - |F| \geq n + 12 - \frac{4}{3}|M|$. For $\delta \geq 5$ we have $c^2 < c + 1$ and so can only simplify Equation 1 to

$$(c + 1)(|F_C| + |F_H|) \leq (c + 1)|M| - (c + 1)12$$

hence $2|M| = n - |F| \geq n + 12 - |M|$. The bounds follow after rearranging. \square

For $\delta = 4, 5$ these are close to the bounds of $\frac{1}{3}(n + 4)$ (for $\delta = 4$) and $\frac{1}{5}(2n + 3)$ (for $\delta = 5$) that we know to be the tight lower bounds on the maximum matching size [5]. Unfortunately we do not know how improve Theorem 2 for $\delta > 3$; the techniques of Section 5 do not work for higher minimum degree since we will use another inequality (Observation 3) that is not strong enough to achieve the bound for higher degrees, and not easily improved.

The case $\delta \geq 6$ is also interesting. Here one would hope for even larger matching-bounds. Unfortunately, the bottleneck in our analysis is our treatment of flowers of length 3. Here we remove one free vertex and one matching-edge, which can at best lead to a bound of $|M| \geq \frac{1}{3}(n + O(1))$. So a further improvement of the bound for minimum degree $\delta \geq 6$ would require treating short flowers differently.




Figure 5: A graph with a matching marked in thick edges of size $\frac{n+12}{8}$. No 3-augmenting path exists for the chosen matching, but there are 5-augmenting paths. The gray area marks an example of 16 vertices such that only 2 matching edges exist. Repeating this configuration gives the example for arbitrary n .

4.1 Stopping earlier?

Currently we remove all augmenting paths up to length 9 before returning the matching. Naturally one wonders whether one could stop earlier?

It is possible to show that it would suffice to remove only 7-augmenting paths. Inspecting the analysis, one sees that the absence of augmenting paths of length exactly 9 is used only once: In the proof of Lemma 1, we use it to argue that a vertex $t \in T_H$ is not adjacent to a 7-cycle flower. Digging further, one can verify that 7-cycle-flowers need to be removed only to avoid matching-edges within U . It turns out that one can deal with matching-edges within U directly, by arguing that at most three vertices in T_H can have an endpoint at such an edge (else there is a 7-augmenting path), and removing these vertices and matching-edges and accounting for them directly. The details are not difficult but tedious and require even more notation; we will not give them.

On the other hand, it is not enough to remove only 3-augmenting paths. Figure 5 shows an example of a matching in a 1-planar graph that has no 3-augmenting paths, but only size $\frac{n+12}{8}$. We can show that this is as bad as it can get.

Theorem 3. *Let G be a 1-planar graph with minimum degree 3 and let M be a matching without 3-augmenting paths. Then $|M| \geq \frac{n+12}{8}$.*

Proof. The proof is very similar to the one of Theorem 2 in [12] except that we use Lemma 2 rather than the edge-bound for planar bipartite graphs. We repeat it here for completeness,

mimicking their notation. Let M_c be all those matching-edges (x, y) for which some free vertex $f \in F$ is adjacent to both x and y , and let F_c be all such free vertices. Vertex f is necessarily the only F -neighbour of x and y , else there would be a 3-augmenting path. Hence $|F_c| \leq |M_c|$.

Let M_o and F_o be the remaining matching-edges and free vertices. For each edge (x, y) in M_o , at most one of the ends can have F -neighbours, else (x, y) would be in M_c or there would be a 3-augmenting path. Let S be the ends of edges in M_o that have F -neighbours, and let G' be the auxiliary graph induced by F and S . Since F is an independent set, we have $|F_o| \leq 6|S| - 12 \leq 6|M_o| - 12$ by Lemma 2.

Putting both together, $2|M| = n - |F| \geq n + 12 - |M_c| - 6|M_o| \geq n + 12 - 6|M|$ and the bound follows after rearranging. \square

5 Proof of Lemma 4

In this section, we prove Lemma 4, i.e., we show that

$$|F| \leq |M_C| + |M_B| + 5|M_S| + 4|M_U| - 12.$$

The following proof does not quite work, but puts us in the right direction. Consider the graph H defined earlier. For any $t \in T_H$ that has U -neighbours, contract t into one of its U -neighbours. In the resulting graph all F_H -vertices and the remaining T_H -vertices have three S -neighbours and all U -vertices have at least as many S -neighbours as the number of T_H -vertices that were contracted into them. Also, all vertices not in S form an independent set. If the resulting graph is 1-planar, we could hence use Lemma 2 to bound $|F_H| + |T_H|$ as sufficiently small.

Unfortunately, 1-planar graphs are not closed under contraction, so for some vertices in T_H we need to use a different technique instead. This requires some detours, and we give a brief outline. We first assign T_H -vertices to a carefully chosen U -neighbour (T_H -vertices that have no U -neighbours remain unchanged in the graph). Next eliminate U -vertices with few assigned T_H -vertices; these can be accounted for easily. In the resulting drawing I , we transform the remaining assigned T_H -vertex one-by-one, either by contracting it along an uncrossed edge (but we prefer to view it as deletion plus insertion of a new edge), or by adding a new vertex to the S -set that has many uncrossed edges. Letting J be the resulting final drawing, we apply Lemma 2 (in a stronger form) to the bipartite graph J to prove Lemma 4. We phrase these procedures as if they were algorithms, but remind the reader that they are only used for the analysis and not needed for finding the matching.

The super-graph H^+ Fix an arbitrary 1-planar drawing of H ; from now on we use H (as well as the graphs H^+, I, J derived from it) to mean both the graph and the 1-planar drawing that comes with it, and which will not be changed unless stated explicitly.

We obtain a 1-planar drawing H^+ from H by inserting/re-routing edges as follows. Let (x, y) (for some $x \in S \cup U$ and $y \in T_H \cup F_H$) be a potential kite-edge of some crossing c of H .

If (x, y) does not yet exist in H , then add it. If (x, y) exists already in H and is crossed, then re-route (x, y) as the kite-edge so that it becomes uncrossed. If (x, y) exists as uncrossed edge in H already, then do not insert it (so that H^+ stays simple). However, if $y \in T_H$ and crossing c involves the matching-edge at y , then re-route (x, y) (if needed) to be at crossing c rather than elsewhere. Repeat for all such potential kite-edges (x, y) . See also Figure 6.




Figure 6: Re-routing kite-edges that are crossed or not incident near the matching edge, and trading matching-partners. The gray areas symbolize other parts of the graph. Dotted edges indicate possible connections.

We also *trade matching-partners* as follows. Assume that H^+ contains two matching edges (s, t) and (s', t') (with $s, s' \in S$ and $t, t' \in T_H$) that cross each other. We inserted (or re-drew) kite-edges (s, t') and (s', t) at this crossing. We now remove edges (s, t) and (s', t') from the matching and declare (s, t') and (s', t) to be matching-edges instead, noting that these are uncrossed. This exchange would not necessarily have been possible in G where these kite-edges need not exist, but we do it here only for the purpose of explaining how to transform T_H -vertices and do not actually change the returned matching. From now on, “matching-edge” and “matching-partner” refers to the status after this trading. We summarize the properties of H^+ for future reference:

Lemma 6. H^+ is a simple graph with a fixed 1-planar drawing that satisfies the following.

- (a) Any edge has at least one endpoint in $S \cup U$.
- (b) Vertices in $T_H \cup F_H$ have degree 3 or more and all their neighbours are in $S \cup U$.
- (c) If (x, y) is a potential kite-edge at crossing c for some $x \in S \cup U$ and $y \in T_H \cup F_H$, then (x, y) exists as an uncrossed edge in H^+ . If c involves the matching-edge (if any) at y , then (x, y) is routed at crossing c .
- (d) No two crossing ST_H -edges are both matching-edges.
- (e) Any vertex in $T_H \cup F_H$ has at least one incident uncrossed edge.

Proof. (a) held in H and we only added kite-edges that do not violate it. (b) held in H and we only added edges. (c) and (d) hold by construction of the drawing of H^+ and since we

traded matching-partners. It remains to show (e). Fix some $y \in T_H \cup F_H$ and let $x \in S \cup U$ be an arbitrary neighbour. If (y, x) is uncrossed then we are done. If (y, x) is crossed, say by edge (a, b) , then up to renaming $a \in S \cup U$ by (a). Therefore (y, a) is a potential kite-edge which exists as uncrossed edge in H^+ by (c). \square

Assignment to U -vertices We split F_H further. Call $f \in F_H$ *high-degree* if it has degree 4 or more in H^+ , and let F_* be the high-degree vertices. We also split T_H and assign them to U -neighbours with the following ASSIGNMENTALGORITHM. For each $t \in T_H$:

- If t has an uncrossed edge to a U -neighbour:
 - Add t to a set T_μ . (As we will see, vertices in T_μ use their matching-edges during the transformation explained later, hence the “ μ ”.)
 - If the matching-edge (t, s) is crossed by an edge (y, u) with $u \in U$, then assign t to this u (noting that edge (t, u) exists as uncrossed kite-edge at this crossing).
 - Otherwise assign t to an arbitrary U -neighbour u for which edge (t, u) is uncrossed.
- Otherwise, if t has at least three S -neighbours, add t to T_σ . (The “ σ ” reminds of S ; vertices in T_σ have sufficiently many S -neighbours that we do not need to transform them.)
- Otherwise, if the matching-edge (s, t) is uncrossed, then add t to T_μ and assign t to an arbitrary U -neighbour. (This exists since $\deg(t) \geq 3$, but it has at most two S -neighbours and no F_H -neighbours.)
- Otherwise, the matching-edge (s, t) and all edges to U -neighbours are crossed. Add t to a set T_ρ (“ ρ ” stands for “remaining”). These vertices will be more difficult to transform, but their neighbourhood has a particular structure. We explain this in detail in Lemma 7 (see also Figure 8(a)), but need to anticipate here a few things to be able to specify the U -neighbour that we assign t to.

Let (x, y) be the edge that crosses (s, t) , say at crossing c_s ; up to renaming $x \in S \cup U$ by Lemma 6(a). The potential kite-edge (x, t) of c_s exists as uncrossed edge in H^+ , which shows that $x \notin U$ since the first case did not apply. So $x \in S$. Also crossing c_s involves matching-edge (s, t) , so (x, t) is routed at c and consecutive with (s, t) in the cyclic order at t . Let (u, t) be the edge such that the cyclic order at t contains $\langle (x, t), (s, t), (u, t) \rangle$ as consecutive elements. If $u \in S$ then t would have three S -neighbours x, s, u and be in T_σ . So $u \notin S$ which implies $u \in U$ since all neighbours of t are in $S \cup U$. Assign t to u .

If $t \in T_H \setminus T_\sigma$ has been assigned to $u \in U$, then we call (t, u) the *assignment-edge* of t . Observe that if t has any uncrossed edge to a U -neighbour, then its assignment-edge is also uncrossed and t always belongs to T_μ (even if it has many S -neighbours).

Let U^d be the set of all those vertices $u \in U$ that have d incident assignment-edges. Let T^d be all those vertices in $T_H \setminus T_\sigma$ that have been assigned to a vertex in U^d . Since $|T^d| = d|U^d|$, we have:

Observation 3. $|T_0| = 0$ and $\sum_{d=1}^3 |T^d| \leq 3 \sum_{d=0}^3 |U^d|$.

So the vertices in $T^1 \cup T^2 \cup T^3$ can be accounted for directly by the matching edges incident to $U^0 \cup U^2 \cup U^3$. We only need to bound the remaining T -vertices, which are those in T_σ as well as those in $T_I := \bigcup_{d \geq 4} T^d$.

The transformation-algorithm Let I be the 1-planar tripartite subgraph of H^+ defined as follows:

- One side consists of the vertices in S . In our examples these are squares.
- A second side consists of the vertices in $F_H \cup U \cup T_\sigma$. In our examples, these are circles.
- The third side consists of $T_I = \bigcup_{d \geq 4} T^d$. In our examples, these are crosses.
- We add all edges from $T_H \cup F$ to $S \cup U$ that existed in H^+ , but none of the edges from S to U .

Graph I inherits its 1-planar drawing from H^+ . Note that for $y \in T_I \cup F_H \cup T_\sigma$ all incident edges of H^+ were transferred to I ; in particular $\deg_I(y) \geq 3$.

To turn I into a bipartite 1-planar graph, we run procedure TRANSFORMATIONALGORITHM described below. This has one step per vertex $t \in T_I$, and either deletes t and replaces it by an SU -edge (which requires care that the drawing remains 1-planar), or moves t to the second side (this requires deleting edges to U -neighbours and hence effort to keep the degree sufficiently big). Figure 7 shows an example of this transformation algorithm.

We need some notations. Set $T_I(0) := T_I$ and let $T_I(j)$ be the vertices that have not yet been processed after step j . Throughout the transformation we maintain a drawing of the current graph; let I_j be the drawing after step j (I_0 is the same as I).

We also dynamically maintain sets T_μ and T_ρ . For $j \geq 0$, set $T_\mu(j)$ to be the vertices $t \in T_I(j)$ for which (in I_j) the matching-edge and/or the assignment-edge is uncrossed. All vertices in T_μ are in $T_\mu(0)$, but other vertices may get added since some vertices of H^+ (e.g. U^0, T^1, \dots) are not included in I and hence edges may become uncrossed. As we transform vertices, further edges may become uncrossed, so other vertices may move from $T_\rho(j-1)$ to $T_\mu(j)$. We never add crossings, so $T_\rho(j)$ can only decrease.

For $j = 1, 2, \dots, |T_I|$, step j of our TRANSFORMATIONALGORITHM proceeds as follows:

1. If $T_\mu(j-1)$ is non-empty, say $t \in T_\mu(j-1)$ (we call the following a μ -transformation, see Figure 7(b) and (c)):
 - (a) Let (t, s) be the matching-edge and (t, u) be the assignment-edge at t .
 - (b) Delete t and replace it by edge (s, u) . Normally (s, u) is routed along the path $s-t-u$ in I_{j-1} , which has at most one crossing by $t \in T_\mu(j-1)$. But if this leads to a crossing of (s, u) with an edge that ends at s or u then instead draw (s, u) as a kite-edge of that crossing so that the drawing remains good.




Figure 7: (a) A part of a graph H^+ . Dashed edges were added as kite-edges and arrows indicate assignments. Vertices are labeled with the sets they belong to. Gray areas symbolize the remaining graph and its incident dotted edges are possible connections. (b) A μ -transformation. The new edge gets routed as kite-edge. This causes one vertex in T_ρ to move to T_μ . (c) Another μ -transformation. The new edge gets routed along the eliminated vertex. (d) A ρ -elimination.

2. Else let $t \in T_\rho(j-1)$ (we call the following a ρ -transformation, see Figure 7(d) and 8(b)):
 - (a) Let (t, s) be the matching-edge and (t, u) be the assignment-edge at t .
 - (b) By Lemma 7 (proved below) we know that there exists a region in I_{j-1} containing three vertices t, f, y , where $f \in F_*$ and $y \in T_\sigma \cup F_H$.
 - (c) Insert a new vertex s_ρ and make it adjacent to t, f, y with uncrossed edges.
 - (d) Vertex s_ρ sends 3 charges each to y and t , and 6 charges to f .
 - (e) Insert an edge (s_ρ, u) and route it near path s_ρ - t - u with one crossing,
 - (f) Delete all edges from t to U -neighbours (in particular edge (t, u)).

Properties Crucial for the correctness of the algorithm is the following characterization of a vertex of a ρ -transformation that is illustrated in Figure 8(a).




Figure 8: (a) The structure at a vertex $t \in T_\rho(0)$. There may be other U -neighbours, but $(t, x), (t, s), (t, u)$ are consecutive. (b) Doing a ρ -transformation at t . (c) If $y \in T_\mu$ or $f \in T_\mu$, then c_s respectively c_u would disappear before transforming t .

Lemma 7. Let $t \in T_I$ be a vertex that undergoes a ρ -transformation at step ℓ . Let (t, s) and (t, u) be its matching-edge and assignment-edge.

1. In drawing I_0 :
 - (a) The matching-edge (t, s) is crossed by some edge (x, y) with $x \in S$.
 - (b) The assignment-edge (t, u) is crossed by some (x', f) with $x' \in S$.
 - (c) $x = x'$ and the edge (t, x) exists as uncrossed edge.
 - (d) $y \in F_H \cup T_\sigma$.
 - (e) $f \in F_*$ (recall that this means that $\deg_I(f) \geq 4$).
2. The same set of edges with the same set of crossings exist in $I_{\ell-1}$.
3. Vertices f, t, y all belong to one region of drawing $I_{\ell-1}$.

Proof. Consider the situation in I_0 . We know that (t, s) and (t, u) are both crossed (else $t \notin T_\rho(0)$ and therefore $t \notin T_\rho(\ell)$), so (t, s) is crossed by some edge (x, y) at c_s and (t, u) is crossed by some (x', f) at c_u . As discussed during the assignment-algorithm, up to renaming $x, x' \in S \cup U$, and actually $x, x' \in S$ because otherwise t would have an uncrossed edge to a U -neighbour, contradicting its crossed assignment-edge (t, u) . This proves (1a) and (1b).

Since edge (t, s) is crossed while (t, x) and (t, x') are uncrossed, we know $x \neq s \neq x'$. If $x \neq x'$ then t has three S -neighbours and would belong to T_σ rather than $T_\rho(0)$. So $x = x'$, which proves (1c) since (t, x) exists as potential kite-edge of c_s .

To prove (1d), recall that by $x \in S$ we know $y \in T_H \cup F_H$. Assume that $y \in T_H$ (else (1d) holds trivially). Then it has the S -neighbours s and x since we added kite-edges. Its matching-partner is not s (since (s, t) is a matching-edge) and also not x (else (s, t) and (x, y) would have traded matching-partners). So its matching-partner is a third S -neighbour s_y . Since y has three S -neighbours, we hence either add it to T_μ or to T_σ . We are done if $y \in T_\sigma$, so assume for contradiction that $y \in T_\mu \subseteq T_\mu(0)$. Since y can use a μ -transformation, it will be transformed *before* t ; say this happens at step $j < \ell$. This μ -transformation deletes y and inserts edge (u_y, s_y) for some $u_y \in U$, see Figure 8(c). By $s_y \neq x$ this eliminates crossing c_s and t moves to $T_\mu(j)$, contradicting that we used a ρ -transformation for t . So (1d) holds.

Proving 1(e) is similar. By $x \in S$ we know $f \in T_H \cup F_H$. Assume first that $f \in F_H$. Then it has three S -neighbours in G (hence in H^+) and kite-edge (f, u) was inserted in H^+ . Hence $f \in F^*$ and (1e) holds. So assume now for contradiction that $f \in T_H$, which implies $f \in T_\mu$ since (f, u) is uncrossed in H^+ . Since f can use a μ -transformation, it will be transformed *before* t ; say this happens at step $j < \ell$. This μ -transformation deletes f and inserts edge (u_f, s_f) where s_f and u_f are the matching-partner and assigned U -neighbour. If $s_f \neq x$, then this will eliminate crossing c_u . If $s_f = x$, then our choice of assignment-edges ensured that $u_f = u$ and the μ -transformations inserts $(s_f, u_f) = (x, u)$ as kite-edge of c_u . See Figure 8(c). So either way c_u will no longer exist in I_j , hence t moves to $T_\mu(j)$, contradicting that we used a ρ -transformation for t . So (1e) holds.

To prove (2), assume the situation changes when transforming vertex t' in step j , where $0 < j < \ell$ and hence $t' \neq t$. The only edges that are changed by a transformation are those incident to t' . But none of the edges among $\{t, s, u, x, y, f\}$ is incident to t' since $t \neq t'$ and the other vertices do not belong to T_μ .

Finally to prove (3), recall that we chose u carefully such that $(t, x), (t, s), (t, u)$ are consecutive at t in I_0 . No new edges are inserted at T_I -vertices that have not yet been transformed, so they remain consecutive in $I_{\ell-1}$. Edges (t, y) and (t, f) are potential kite-edges, so if we inserted them into the order of edges at t it would become $(t, s), (t, y), (t, f), (t, u)$. So y and f are consecutive at t , which means that y, t, f belong to one region of $I_{\ell-1}$. \square

Note that any drawing I_j is simple. This holds for I_0 since we did not add multiple edges to H^+ . Any edge inserted during a ρ -transformation leads to a new vertex, hence does not previously exist. Any edge (s, u) inserted during a μ -transformation replaces a path $s-t-u$ where (s, t) is a matching-edge; this happens at most once to vertex s . Since I_0 had no SU -edges, therefore (s, u) did not previously exist. Also note that by construction I_j is a 1-planar good drawing.

Crossing-weighted degrees For any vertex v , let the *crossing-weighted degree* of v be the degree plus the number of incident uncrossed edges. We use this to account for the charges distributed during ρ -transformation.

Claim 3. *Let $v \in T_\sigma \cup F_H$ and assume that there were k ρ -transformations that sent charges to v in the first j steps (for some $j, k \geq 0$). Then the crossing-weighted degree of v in I_j is at least $4 + 2k$, and at least $5 + 2k$ if v is in F_* .*

Proof. Consider $j = 0$. At least one incident edge of v is uncrossed in I_0 (Lemma 6). So its crossing-weighted degree is at least $\deg_I(v) + 1$. The claim holds since no charges have been sent yet.

Now assume v receives charges at time $j > 0$, so we did a ρ -transformation and inserted a new vertex s_ρ with an uncrossed edge to v . This increases the crossing-weighted degree by 2 since uncrossed edges count twice. \square

Claim 4. *Any vertex t that was transformed with a ρ -transformation has crossing-weighted degree at least 5 after the transformation and never receives further charges.*

Proof. Continuing in the notation of Lemma 7, vertex t has a crossed edge to s and uncrossed edges to x and the newly inserted s_ρ , hence its crossing-weighted degree is at least 5 after the transformation. Since charges are only sent to vertices in $T_\sigma \cup F_H$ and the currently transformed vertex, t will never receive further charges. \square

Putting it all together Let J be the drawing I_N , i.e., after all vertices in T_I have been transformed ($N = |T_I|$). A few notations will be helpful. Let $T'_\rho \subseteq T_\rho$ be those vertices that underwent a ρ -transformation, and let S_ρ be the new vertices inserted during these ρ -transformations. Each $s \in S_\rho$ sent charges to its neighbours in $T_\sigma \cup F_H \cup T'_\rho$. Let T_σ^k and F^k be the vertices in T_σ and F , respectively, that received charges from k vertices in S_ρ (vertices in T'_ρ receive charges only once). Let F_*^k be the special vertices in F^k . From the way charges were sent, we have:

Observation 4. $12|S_\rho| \leq 3|T'_\rho| + \sum_{k \geq 1} 3k \left(|F^k \setminus F_*^k| + |T_\sigma^k| \right) + \sum_{k \geq 1} 6k|F_*^k|.$

Recall that U^d (for $d \geq 0$) denotes the vertices in U that were assigned d vertices of T_I . In the created drawing J , for $d \geq 4$ any $u \in U^d$ has d incident neighbours, because a μ -transformation replaces $s-t-u$ by (s, u) , and a ρ -transformation adds an edge (u, s_ρ) for a new vertex s_ρ . Hence u has crossing-weighted degree at least d .

The matching bound now follows by applying Lemma 2 to drawing J and combining it with all other inequalities we derived earlier. We actually need a slightly modified version of Lemma 2, also proved in [5].

Lemma 8 ([5]). *Let G be a 1-planar simple graph and A be a non-empty independent set in G where all vertices of A have degree 3 or more. Let W_d be the vertices in A that have crossing-weighted degree d . Then*

$$2|W_3| + 2|W_4| + \sum_{d \geq 5} (3d - 12)|W_d| \leq 12|V \setminus A| - 24.$$

Lemma 9. $2|F_H| + 2|T_H| \leq 12|S| + 8|U| - 24$.

Proof. The vertices in $F_H \cup T_\sigma \cup T'_\rho \cup \bigcup_{d \geq 4} U^d$ are independent in J and each have minimum degree 3. The remaining vertices of J are just $S \cup S_\rho$. Using Lemma 8 and the various bounds on the crossing-weighted degree, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& 12|S| + 12|S_\rho| - 24 \\
\geq & 2|F^0| + 2|T_\sigma^0| + \sum_{k \geq 1} \left(3(4 + 2k) - 12 \right) (|F^k \setminus F_*^k| + |T_\sigma^k|) \\
& + \sum_{k \geq 1} \left(3(5 + 2k) - 12 \right) |F_*^k| + (3 \cdot 5 - 12) |T'_\rho| + \sum_{d \geq 4} (3d - 12) |U^d| \\
\geq & 2|F^0| + 2|T_\sigma^0| + \sum_{k \geq 1} (3k + 2) (|F^k \setminus F_*^k| + |T_\sigma^k|) + \sum_{k \geq 1} (6k + 2) |F_*^k| + 3|T'_\rho| + \sum_{d \geq 4} (2d - 8) |U^d| \\
& \text{(by } 6k \geq 3k + 2 \text{ for } k \geq 1 \text{ and } 3d - 12 \geq 2d - 8 \text{ for } d \geq 4) \\
\geq & 2|F_H| + 2|T_\sigma| + \sum_{k \geq 1} 3k (|F^k \setminus F_*^k| + |T_\sigma^k|) + \sum_{k \geq 1} 6k |F_*^k| + 3|T'_\rho| + 2 \sum_{d \geq 4} d |U^d| - 8 \sum_{d \geq 4} |U^d| \\
\geq & 2|F_H| + 2|T_\sigma| + 12|S_\rho| + 2 \sum_{d \geq 4} |T^d| - 8 \sum_{d \geq 4} |U^d|
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging and adding $2(|T_1| + |T^2| + |T^3|) \leq 6(|U^0| + \dots + |U^3|)$ gives

$$12|S| + 8 \sum_{d \geq 0} |U^d| - 24 \geq 2|F_H| + 2|T_\sigma| + 2 \sum_{d \geq 1} |T^d| = 2|F_H| + 2|T_H|$$

This proves Lemma 9 by $|U| = \sum_d |U^d|$. □

Using $|S| = |M_S|$ and $|U| = |M_U|$ therefore we have

$$\begin{array}{ll}
2|F_H| + 2|T_H| \leq 12|M_S| + 8|M_U| - 24 & \text{from Lemma 9} \\
2|F_C| \leq 2|M_C| & \text{from Claim 1} \\
2|T_B| \leq 2|M_B| & \text{from Claim 2}
\end{array}$$

which when combined give

$$2|F| + 2|M_S| = 2|F_C| + 2|F_H| + 2|T_B| + 2|T_H| \leq 2|M_C| + 2|M_B| + 12|M_S| + 8|M_U| - 24.$$

and Lemma 4 holds.

6 Summary and outlook

In this paper, we considered how to find a large matching in a 1-planar graph with minimum degree 3. We argued that any matching without augmenting paths of length up to 9 has size at least $\frac{n+12}{7}$, which is the largest that one can hope for in a 1-planar graph with minimum

degree 3. Such a matching can easily be found in linear time, even if no 1-planar drawings is known, by stopping the matching algorithm by Micali and Vazirani after a constant number of rounds.

It remains open how to find large matchings in 1-planar graphs with minimum degree $\delta > 3$; we can argue some lower bounds on the size of matchings without 9-augmenting paths, but these are not tight. It would also be interesting to study other near-planar graph classes such as k -planar graphs (for $k > 1$); here we do not even know what tight matching-bounds exist and much less how to find matchings of that size in linear time.

References

- [1] B. Baker. Approximation algorithms for NP-complete problems on planar graphs. *J. ACM*, 41(1):153–180, 1994.
- [2] H. Bast, Kurt Mehlhorn, Guido Schäfer, and Hisao Tamaki. Matching algorithms are fast in sparse random graphs. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 39(1):3–14, 2006.
- [3] C. Berge. *Graphs and Hypergraphs, 2nd edition*. North-Holland, 1976. Translated from *Graphes et Hypergraphes, Dunod, 1970*.
- [4] T. Biedl, P. Bose, E. Demaine, and A. Lubiw. Efficient algorithms for Petersen’s theorem. *J. Algorithms*, 38(1):110–134, 2001.
- [5] T. Biedl and J. Wittnebel. Matchings in 1-planar graphs with large minimum degree, 2019. CoRR 1911.04603.
- [6] K. Booth and G. Lueker. Testing for the consecutive ones property, interval graphs and graph planarity using PQ-tree algorithms. *Journal of Computing and System Sciences*, 13:335–379, 1976.
- [7] N. Chiba and T. Nishizeki. The Hamiltonian cycle problem is linear-time solvable for 4-connected planar graphs. *J. Algorithms*, 10(2):187–211, 1989.
- [8] R. Cole, K. Ost, and S. Schirra. Edge-coloring bipartite multigraphs in $O(E \log D)$ time. *Combinatorica*, 21(1):5–12, 2001.
- [9] E. Demaine, F. Fomin, M. Hajiaghayi, and D. Thilikos. Subexponential parameterized algorithms on bounded-genus graphs and H-minor-free graphs. *J. ACM*, 52(6):866–893, 2005.
- [10] R. Diestel. *Graph Theory, 4th Edition*, volume 173 of *Graduate texts in mathematics*. Springer, 2012.
- [11] J. Edmonds. Maximum matchings and a polyhedron with 0,1-vertices. *Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards*, 69B:125–130, 1965.

- [12] Robert Franke, Ignaz Rutter, and Dorothea Wagner. Computing large matchings in planar graphs with fixed minimum degree. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412(32):4092–4099, 2011.
- [13] A. Grigoriev and H. Bodlaender. Algorithms for graphs embeddable with few crossings per edge. *Algorithmica*, 49(1):1–11, 2007.
- [14] M. Hall. An algorithm for distinct representatives. *American Math. Monthly*, 63:716–717, 1956.
- [15] J. E. Hopcroft and R. E. Tarjan. Efficient planarity testing. *J. Association Computing Machinery*, 21(4):549–568, 1974.
- [16] John E. Hopcroft and Richard M. Karp. An $n^{5/2}$ algorithm for maximum matchings in bipartite graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 2:225–231, 1973.
- [17] S. Kobourov, G. Liotta, and F. Montecchiani. An annotated bibliography on 1-planarity. *Computer Science Review*, 25:49–67, 2017.
- [18] L. Lovász and M. D. Plummer. *Matching theory*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1986. Annals of Discrete Mathematics, 29.
- [19] Silvio Micali and Vijay V. Vazirani. An $O(\sqrt{|V|}|E|)$ Algorithm for Finding Maximum Matching in General Graphs. In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'80)*, pages 17–27. IEEE Computer Society, 1980.
- [20] T. Nishizeki and I. Baybars. Lower bounds on the cardinality of the maximum matchings of planar graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 28(3):255–267, 1979.
- [21] J. Petersen. Die Theorie der regulären graphs (The theory of regular graphs). *Acta Mathematica*, 15:193–220, 1891.
- [22] Marcus Schaefer. *Crossing Numbers of Graphs*. CRC Press, 2017.
- [23] W. T. Tutte. A theorem on planar graphs. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 82:99–116, 1956.
- [24] V. Vazirani. An improved definition of blossoms and a simpler proof of the MV matching algorithm. *CoRR*, abs/1210.4594, 2012.