

Recognizing and Embedding Simple Optimal 2-Planar Graphs^{*}

Henry Förster¹[0000–0002–1441–4189], Michael Kaufmann¹[0000–0001–9186–3538],
and Chrysanthi N. Raftopoulou²[0000–0001–6457–516X]

¹ WSI, Tübingen, Germany
{foersth,mk}@informatik.uni-tuebingen.de
² NTUA, Athens, Greece
crisraft@mail.ntua.gr

Abstract. In the area of beyond-planar graphs, i.e. graphs that can be drawn with some local restrictions on the edge crossings, the recognition problem is prominent next to the density question for the different graph classes. For 1-planar graphs, the recognition problem has been settled, namely it is NP-complete for the general case, while optimal 1-planar graphs, i.e. those with maximum density, can be recognized in linear time. For 2-planar graphs, the picture is less complete. As expected, the recognition problem has been found to be NP-complete in general. In this paper, we consider the recognition of simple optimal 2-planar graphs. We exploit a combinatorial characterization of such graphs and present a linear time algorithm for recognition and embedding.

Keywords: 2-planar graphs · recognition algorithms · beyond-planarity

1 Introduction

In the field of graph drawing beyond planarity, researchers study graphs that admit drawings with crossings only in restrictive local configurations [6,14,15,18,24]. Mostly studied are *1-planar graphs*, which admit drawings where each edge is crossed at most once. Classic results on these graphs concern mostly the density [7,28], recently, other problems such as generation [29], characterization [20], recognition [2,9,10,11,13], coloring [8] and page number [3,16] have been studied. The most natural extension of 1-planar graphs, is the family of *k-planar graphs*, that is graphs that admit drawings where each edge is crossed at most k times. While there are plenty of results on 1-planarity, k -planarity turns out to be more challenging. The first outstanding results on the density of simple k -planar graphs came with the work of Pach and Tóth [27] for $k \leq 4$. In particular, they proved that simple 2-planar graphs have at most $5n - 10$ edges. Later on, improved upper bounds of $5.5n - 11$ [26] and $6n - 12$ [1] have been shown for simple 3- and

^{*} The work of C. Raftopoulou is funded by the National Technical University of Athens research program IIEBE 2020. H. Förster and M. Kaufmann are supported by DFG grant KA812-18/2.

4-planar graphs, respectively. The bounds for 2- and 3-planar graphs are tight even for non-simple graph without homotopic parallel edges and self-loops [5].

While testing for planarity can be done in linear time, and several classes of beyond-planar graphs have a linear number of edges, the corresponding recognition problems are NP-hard, which impedes the practical application of related results. In particular, it was recently proven that the recognition of k -planar graphs is NP-hard for every value of $k \geq 1$ [30]. Still, optimal 1-planar graphs, which form a prominent subclass of 1-planar graphs, can be recognized in linear time [11], while recognition of maximal 1-planar graphs and 4-maps takes cubic time [17,12]. Previously, efficient recognition algorithms have been developed for more restricted subclasses of 1-planar graphs, see e.g. [2,10,13,19].

For $k \geq 2$, there are significantly fewer results. A notable result is the linear time recognition algorithm for full outer-2-planar graphs [21], while for $k \geq 3$ the literature still lacks similar results.

Our contribution. In this paper, we extend the study on the recognition of subclasses of k -planar graphs. Namely, we prove that simple optimal 2-planar graphs, that is simple 2-planar graphs with $5n - 10$ edges, can be efficiently recognized in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time. In our strategy we first remove a set of edges that must be involved in crossings in any optimal 2-planar drawing of the given graph. We unwrap specific properties of the remaining graph that allow us to find a unique drawing and insert the deleted crossing edges.

Paper organization. In Section 2 we give preliminary notations and properties of optimal 2-planar graphs. Section 3 presents CROSS-BAT, an important 2-planar substructure, and examines its structural properties. Section 4 focuses on the insertion of the deleted crossing edges. Our recognition algorithm in Section 5 combines all previous results. We conclude in Section 6 with further research directions. Due to space constraints, several proofs and details, indicated by (*), are deferred to an appendix.

2 Preliminaries

The degree of a vertex $v \in V$ is denoted by $d(v)$ and its set of neighbors by $N(v)$. For $u, v \in V$ we write $N(u, v)$ to denote the set of common neighbors of u and v , that is $N(u, v) = N(u) \cap N(v)$. A *drawing* of a graph maps the vertices to points in the plane and the edges to simple open Jordan curves connecting the points corresponding to their endpoints. A drawing is *k -planar* if each curve representing an edge is crossed at most k times by the other edges together. A graph G is *k -planar* if it admits a *k -planar drawing*.

The topology of a planar drawing is described by a *rotation scheme*. For k -planarity, a *k -planar rotation scheme* specifies the counter-clockwise circular order of edges around each vertex and, additionally, a sequence of at most k crossings along each edge. Hence, a k -planar rotation scheme defines an equivalence class of k -planar drawings.

For a graph G , let H a subgraph of G and let \mathcal{R}_H be a (k -planar) rotation scheme of H . We say that \mathcal{R}_H is a *partial (k -planar) rotation scheme* of G . We

further say that \mathcal{R}_H can be extended to a (k -planar) rotation scheme \mathcal{R} of G if the restriction of \mathcal{R} on H is \mathcal{R}_H . Conversely, we say that \mathcal{R} extends \mathcal{R}_H . Let C be a cycle of graph G , whose edges define a simple closed curve in a drawing Γ of G . We refer to the region to the left of this curve in a counter-clockwise walk along C in Γ as the *interior of the region* bounded by cycle C . Note that given drawing Γ , the interior of a region may be unbounded.

A 2-planar graph that reaches the upper bound of $5n - 10$ edges is called *optimal 2-planar*. Note that the value of $5n - 10$ edges can be reached only when $n \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$. Each induced subgraph H of a 2-planar graph G is also 2-planar and thus has at most $5|V(H)| - 10$ edges. This implies that if G is 2-planar then it is also *9-degenerate*, i.e. there is a vertex ordering v_1, \dots, v_n such that, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, vertex v_i of the induced subgraph $G_i = G[v_1, \dots, v_i]$ has degree at most 9 in G_i . We call such a vertex ordering a *9-degenerate* sequence of G .

In this work, we consider only *simple* graphs which we assume from now on without explicitly stating it. The structure of simple optimal 2-planar graphs is well established. Namely, an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R} of a simple optimal 2-planar graph specifies a crossing-free 3-connected³ spanning pentangulation \mathcal{P} and a set of crossing edges [4,5]. The edges around each vertex are cyclically ordered so that every crossing-free edge (belonging to \mathcal{P}) is followed by two crossing edges, which are succeeded by one crossing-free edge, and so on. Hence the degree of every vertex is a multiple of three. Moreover, the minimum degree of a simple optimal 2-planar graph is 9 since \mathcal{P} is 3-connected, i.e., every vertex is incident to at least 3 crossing-free edges. Now, each pentangular face f of \mathcal{P} contains exactly five crossing edges of \mathcal{R} which form a 5-clique in G with the boundary edges of f ; we call such a 5-clique a *facial 5-clique*. Note that not all 5-cliques of G are facial in \mathcal{R} . This is a major difficulty for recognizing optimal 2-planar graphs. We denote a facial 5-clique of \mathcal{R} with outer cycle (c_0, \dots, c_4) as $\langle c_0, \dots, c_4 \rangle$ and say that the crossing edges (c_i, c_j) with $(i - j) \pmod{5} \in \{2, 3\}$ belong to $\langle c_0, \dots, c_4 \rangle$. As \mathcal{P} is 3-connected, it suffices to detect all facial 5-cliques to find the optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of a given input graph, if one exists.

In the following, we state some preliminary observations and properties that we will use in the remainder of the paper. In particular, Properties 2.1–2.4 immediately arise from the combinatorial characterization of simple optimal 2-planar graphs in [5] also summarized above. So, let G be an optimal 2-planar graph with an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R} .

Property 2.1. A pair of crossing edges in \mathcal{R} belongs to the same facial 5-clique.

Property 2.2. If in \mathcal{R} , edge e is crossed by two edges e_1 and e_2 , then e_1 and e_2 share a common endpoint. Also, e , e_1 and e_2 belong to the same facial 5-clique.

Property 2.3. Any two facial 5-cliques in \mathcal{R} share at most two vertices.

Property 2.4. A crossing edge of \mathcal{R} belongs to exactly one facial 5-clique and a crossing-free edge of \mathcal{R} belongs to exactly two facial 5-cliques.

³ The 3-connectivity derives from the fact that the graph is simple.




Fig. 1: Forbidden configuration excluded by Corollary 2.2.

Combining the above properties we can further prove the following:

Corollary 2.1 (*). *For two edges (u, v) and (u, w) of an optimal 2-planar graph G let $S = N(u, v) \cup N(u, w) \cup \{u, v, w\}$. If $|S| < 8$, then (u, v) and (u, w) belong to the same facial 5-clique in any optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G .*

Corollary 2.2. *Let G be an optimal 2-planar graph with an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R} . Let (u, v) be a crossing edge inside a facial 5-clique C in \mathcal{R} . Further, let $u' \notin C$ be a neighbor of u and $v' \notin C$ be a neighbor of v . Then, edges (u, u') and (v, v') do not cross in \mathcal{R} ; see Fig. 1.*

Consider an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R} of G . If edge (u, v) is crossing-free in \mathcal{R} , then by Property 2.4 u and v belong to two facial 5-cliques. Hence, $|N(u, v)| \geq 6$ holds. Although this condition is not sufficient to conclude that an edge is crossing-free, we can use it to identify some crossing edges:

Corollary 2.3. *Let G be an optimal 2-planar graph and $(u, v) \in E(G)$. Edge (u, v) is crossing in any optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G if $|N(u, v)| < 6$.*

Our recognition algorithm relies on the identification of crossing edges based on Corollary 2.3. We say that an edge (u, v) is *clearly crossing* if and only if $|N(u, v)| < 6$. Otherwise (u, v) is *potentially planar*. Note that in an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme, a potentially planar edge is not necessarily crossing-free. However, every crossing-free edge of any optimal 2-planar rotation scheme is potentially planar. We define as G_p the subgraph of G formed by all potentially planar edges. Graph G_p is 3-connected and spans G as the corresponding crossing-free pentangulation of each optimal 2-planar rotation scheme is a subgraph of G_p .

3 The CROSS-BAT configuration

In this section, we study the 3-connected spanning subgraph G_p formed by the potentially planar edges of G . We want to compute a rotation scheme of G_p which is extendable to an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G , if it exists. If in each optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G subgraph G_p is plane, then the rotation scheme of G_p is unique and easy to compute. Though we cannot assure this property, we prove that in any optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G , crossings between edges of G_p occur in restricted configurations: A CROSS-BAT




Fig. 2: (a) Graph G_{CB} : red and black edges are clearly crossing and potentially planar, resp., blue edges might be both, dashed edges may be absent. (b)–(c) the two possible rotation schemes: in (b) edges (u, x') , (u, y') , (u', x) and (u', y) are crossing-free; in (c) edges (u, x) , (u, y) , (u', x') and (u', y') are crossing-free.

instance is an induced subgraph H of G isomorphic to the graph G_{CB} shown in Fig. 2a, so that (i) for edge (u_H, u'_H) of H isomorphic to (u, u') of G_{CB} , it holds that $V(H) = N(u_H) \cup N(u'_H)$, and (ii) the isomorphism between H and G_{CB} preserves the classification of edges to clearly crossing or potentially planar.

In particular, CROSS-BAT has ten vertices, named as in Fig. 2a. Vertices u and u' have degree 9 in G and they have 8 common neighbors (the remaining vertices of CROSS-BAT). The edges of CROSS-BAT form four 5-cliques that pairwise share two vertices, and are shown as facial 5-cliques in Fig. 2a. We call edge (u, u') the *base edge* of CROSS-BAT. No other edges with both endpoints in CROSS-BAT exist, except possibly for edges (v, v') and (w, w') . Fig. 2a shows the classification of edges of CROSS-BAT as potentially planar and clearly crossing.

Let \mathcal{R} be an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G , such that two potentially planar edges cross each other. These two edges must belong to the same facial 5-clique and, in particular, also to an instance of CROSS-BAT.

Lemma 3.1 (*). *Let \mathcal{R} be an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G and let $C = \langle c_0, \dots, c_4 \rangle$ be a facial 5-clique in \mathcal{R} such that (c_1, c_3) and (c_2, c_4) are potentially planar edges. Then, vertices c_2 and c_3 have degree 9 in G , and the induced subgraph H of G with vertex set $V(H) = N(c_2) \cup N(c_3)$ is an instance of CROSS-BAT where C is the 5-clique $\langle v, x', u', u, x \rangle$ of Fig. 2a.*

Next, we show that CROSS-BAT has only two rotation schemes:

Lemma 3.2 (*). *Any instance of CROSS-BAT in an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R} has one of the two rotation schemes shown in Figs. 2b and 2c.*

Sketch. Vertices are named as in Fig. 2a. First, we prove that there are four facial 5-cliques, namely (i) C_v that contains v , (ii) C_w that contains w , (iii) $C_{x,y}$

that contains both x and y , and, (iv) $C_{x',y'}$ that contains both x' and y' . It is then easy to argue that $x, x' \in C_v$, while $y, y' \in C_w$. Finally, we show that w is contained in the crossing-free cycle (u_1, u_2, y', w', y) and v is contained in the crossing-free cycle (u_2, u_1, x, v', x') where $\{u_1, u_2\} = \{u, u'\}$. The two choices for u_1 and u_2 give the two different rotation schemes of Figs. 2b and 2c. \square

As it is evident in Figs. 2b and 2c, if an optimal 2-planar graph G contains an instance of CROSS-BAT as subgraph, then it admits two different optimal 2-planar rotation schemes \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{R}' , that only differ in the choice of the rotation scheme of CROSS-BAT. Hence for any instance of CROSS-BAT, we may arbitrarily choose one of its two rotation schemes. Next, we formalize this observation:

Lemma 3.3. *Let \mathcal{R} be an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G , and let H be an instance of CROSS-BAT in G . If H has the rotation scheme of Fig. 2b in \mathcal{R} , then there exists another optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R}' of G , in which H has the rotation scheme of Fig. 2c, and vice-versa.*

Both rotation schemes of a CROSS-BAT instance contain two crossings between potentially planar edges:

Lemma 3.4 (*). *Let \mathcal{R} be an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G . If G contains an instance H of CROSS-BAT, then there exist exactly two pairs of potentially planar edges that belong to H and cross in \mathcal{R} .*

Using Lemma 3.2 we can fix a rotation scheme for each instance H of CROSS-BAT identified in G by reclassifying two crossing potentially planar edges of H to clearly crossing edges. After performing this reclassification for all instances, if G is optimal 2-planar, then the subgraph G_p induced by the potentially planar edges is planar. Furthermore, in this case, Lemma 3.3 guarantees that the unique planar embedding of G_p is part of an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G .

4 Identifying Facial 5-Cliques

Assume that we have fixed the rotation scheme for every identified instance of CROSS-BAT. Let G_p be the spanning subgraph of G formed by all potentially planar edges after the reclassification process. As discussed in Section 3, G_p is planar and 3-connected, i.e. it has a unique planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R}_p . Furthermore, by Lemma 3.3, if G is optimal 2-planar, it admits an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme that extends \mathcal{R}_p which we call \mathcal{R}_p -compliant. For any \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R} , G_p contains the corresponding spanning pentangulation \mathcal{P} as a subgraph. Hence each face of \mathcal{R}_p has length 3, 4 or 5 and is part of a facial 5-clique. Hence, we can arbitrarily triangulate them and assume from now on that G_p is triangulated. Triangulating a face of \mathcal{R}_p corresponds to reclassifying some chords from clearly crossing to potentially planar.

Let (f_1, f, f_2) be a path in the dual G_p^* of G_p so that $f_1 = (u, w_1, v_1)$, $f = (u, w_2, w_1)$ and $f_2 = (u, v_2, w_2)$, as shown in Fig. 3. If the subgraph induced by the vertices $\{u, v_2, w_2, w_1, v_1\}$ is a 5-clique in G , we call $T = \langle f_1, f, f_2 \rangle$ a




Fig. 3: Illustration of a triplet $\langle f_1, f, f_2 \rangle$, along with its clearly crossing edges e_1 , e_2 and e . Edges of G_p are drawn black, clearly crossing edges of G are red.

triplet. T contains vertices u, v_2, w_2, w_1, v_1 , faces f_1, f, f_2 and the three clearly crossing edges $e_1 = (v_1, w_2)$, $e_2 = (v_2, w_1)$ and $e = (v_1, v_2)$, as shown in Fig. 3. We say that e_1 , e_2 and e belong to triplet T .

In any \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R} (if it exists), faces and clearly crossing edges of \mathcal{R}_p are partitioned into triplets, such that every face and clearly crossing edge belongs to exactly one of these triplets. Furthermore, the triplets are in 1-1 correspondence with the facial 5-cliques of \mathcal{R} . We say that e , e_1 and e_2 are *assigned* to the triplet $T = \langle f_1, f, f_2 \rangle$ w.r.t. \mathcal{R} if T induces a facial 5-clique in \mathcal{R} . Similarly, we say that faces f_1 , f and f_2 of T are *assigned* to T . If such an assignment is not possible, then G is not optimal 2-planar.

Let \mathcal{T} be a set of triplets such that any two triplets in \mathcal{T} are face-disjoint and contain different clearly crossing edges. Consider the partial 2-planar rotation scheme $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}}$ of G that (i) extends \mathcal{R}_p , (ii) the clearly crossing edges of each $T \in \mathcal{T}$ are assigned to T , and (iii) there is no other assignment of clearly crossing edges. We say that \mathcal{T} is *bad* if and only if $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}}$ cannot be extended to a \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R} of G . Our goal is to find an assignment of all clearly crossing edges of G to a set of triplets \mathcal{T} such that \mathcal{T} is not bad if G is optimal 2-planar. We actually prove a stronger result, namely that the set \mathcal{T} is unique. We will use two observations that follow from the simplicity of G :

Observation 4.1. *Let $f = (u, v, w)$ be a triangular face of \mathcal{R}_p and let T be a triplet that contains vertices u, v and w . Then T contains face f .*

Observation 4.2. *Let $f = (u, v, w)$ and $f' = (u', w, v)$ be two adjacent faces of \mathcal{R}_p and (u, u') a clearly crossing edge. Let \mathcal{R} be a \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme and T be the triplet that (u, u') is assigned to w.r.t. \mathcal{R} . Then, either (i) (u, u') is drawn inside f and f' in \mathcal{R} and T contains both f and f' , or (ii) (u, u') is drawn outside f and f' in \mathcal{R} and T contains neither f nor f' .*

If any of e_1 , e_2 or e belongs only to one triplet T , then T is a facial 5-clique in any \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R} and e_1 , e_2 and e can be assigned to T . So, we assume that each of e_1 , e_2 and e belong to at least one triplet different from T . Let T_1 and T_2 be two triplets that contain edges e_1 and e_2 respectively and are different from T . Note that $T_1 = T_2$ might hold. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$. If for each such pair of triplets T_1 and T_2 we can conclude that the set $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$ is bad, then in any \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R} of G (if it exists) edges e_1 , e_2 and e must be assigned to T . In the following,

we compare \mathcal{T} against all possible sets \mathcal{T}' and prove that at least one of \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' is bad. This allows to decide, for each triplet T , if T forms a facial 5-clique in every \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G or in none. Note that when we write $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$ and $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$, we assume that $T = \langle f_1, f, f_2 \rangle$ as shown in Fig. 3 and triplets T_1 and T_2 contain edges e_1 and e_2 , respectively.

We first restrict how triplets T_1 and T_2 relate to triplet T . Observation 4.2 applied to T_1 implies that if T_1 shares either f or f_1 with T , then, in the presence of edge e_1 , T_1 shares both f and f_1 with T . A symmetric argument applies for T_2 . It follows that one of the following cases holds for $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$:

- C.1** T_i is face-disjoint with T , or
- C.2** T_i shares only face f_j with T , or,
- C.3** T_i shares only faces f and f_i with T .

In the next two lemmas, we show that every $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$ is bad if Case C.1 applies either for none or for both of T_1 and T_2 .

Lemma 4.1 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$. If none of T_1 and T_2 is face-disjoint from T , then \mathcal{T}' is bad.*

Lemma 4.2 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$. If both T_1 and T_2 are face-disjoint from T , then \mathcal{T}' is bad.*

Sketch. Assuming that \mathcal{T}' is not bad, we arrive at the configuration shown in Fig. 4a. Since (w_1, w_2) is crossing, Corollary 2.2 is violated. \square

By Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, Case C.1 applies for exactly one of the two triplets T_1 and T_2 and $T_1 \neq T_2$. Then, the other triplet complies with Case C.2 or with Case C.3. For each possible combination we first prove structural properties arising from the assumption that \mathcal{T}' is not bad, and then show that these new restrictions make \mathcal{T} bad. In the next two lemmas, we consider the setting, where one of T_1 and T_2 complies with Case C.1 while the other one complies with C.2.

Lemma 4.3 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$, such that T_1 is face-disjoint from T and T_2 shares only face f_1 with T . For $u \in V(T)$, if (i) $d(u) > 9$, or, (ii) for every vertex $x \in S = N(u) \setminus V(T)$ it holds $|N(x) \cap S| \geq 2$, then \mathcal{T}' is bad.*

Sketch. Assuming that \mathcal{T}' is not bad and $d(u) = 9$, we arrive at the configuration shown in Fig. 4b. We can conclude that not all conditions of the lemma hold. \square

Lemma 4.4 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$ and let $v \in V(T)$ such that $d(v) = 9$. If there exists a vertex $x \in S = N(v) \setminus V(T)$ such that $|N(x) \cap S| \leq 1$, then \mathcal{T} is bad.*

By Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4 it remains to consider the case where one of T_1 and T_2 complies with Case C.1 while the other complies with Case C.3. So, we assume w.l.o.g. that T_1 is face-disjoint with T , while T_2 shares faces f and f_2 with T . Recall that clearly crossing edge e belongs to T . If $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$ is not bad e




Fig. 4: Illustrations for the proofs of (a) Lemma 4.2, and, (b) Lemma 4.3.

belongs to a triplet $T_e \neq T$ such that $\mathcal{T}' \cup \{T_e\}$ is not bad. Note that $T_e \neq T_2$ as otherwise vertex v_1 belongs to T_2 and $T_2 = T$. Hence, either $T_e \neq T_1$ or $T_e = T_1$.

The following four lemmas investigate the subcase $T_e \neq T_1$. Note that T_1 and T_e are face-disjoint as otherwise $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2, T_e\}$ is bad. The first two lemmas examine the scenario where T_1 contains vertex w_1 or T_e contains vertex u of T .

Lemma 4.5 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2, T_e\}$, such that T_1 is face-disjoint from T , T_2 shares faces f and f_2 with T , and T_e is face-disjoint from T_1 . Then:*

- If T_1 contains vertex w_1 of T and additionally (i) $d(w_1) > 9$, or, (ii) there is a vertex $x \in S = N(w_1) \setminus V(T)$ such that $|N(x) \cap S| \geq 4$, then \mathcal{T}' is bad.
- If T_e contains vertex u of T and additionally (i) $d(u) > 9$, or, (ii) there is a vertex $x \in S = N(u) \setminus V(T)$ such that $|N(x) \cap S| \geq 4$, then \mathcal{T}' is bad.

Sketch. Assuming that \mathcal{T}' is not bad and $d(w_1) = 9$, in the first case, we arrive at the configuration shown in Fig. 5a. We conclude that not all conditions hold. \square

Lemma 4.6 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$ and let $v \in V(T)$ with $d(v) = 9$. If for every vertex $x \in S = N(v) \setminus V(T)$ it holds $|N(x) \cap S| \leq 3$, then \mathcal{T} is bad.*

The next two lemmas consider the scenario, where T_1 does not contain vertex w_1 and T_e does not contain vertex u of triplet T .

Lemma 4.7 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2, T_e\}$, such that T_1 is face-disjoint from T , T_2 shares faces f and f_2 with T , and T_e is face-disjoint from T_1 . Assume that T_1 does not contain vertex w_1 and T_e does not contain vertex u of T . If there is no triplet T_{f_1} that contains f_1 such that (i) T_{f_1} shares only vertices of f_1 with T , and, (ii) T_{f_1} is face-disjoint from all of T_1, T_2 and T_e , then \mathcal{T}' is bad.*




Fig. 5: Illustration for the proofs of Lemmas (a) 4.5, (b) 4.8, and, (c) 4.9.

Lemma 4.8 (*). *Let triplets T_1, T_2, T_e be pairwise disjoint such that T_1 is face-disjoint from T , T_2 shares faces f and f_2 with T , T_e is face-disjoint from T_1 , T_1 does not contain vertex w_1 and T_e does not contain vertex u of T . If there is a triplet T_{f_1} that contains f_1 such that (i) T_{f_1} shares only vertices of f_1 with T , and, (ii) T_{f_1} is face-disjoint from all of T_1, T_2 and T_e , then $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$ is bad.*

Sketch. Assuming that \mathcal{T} is not bad, we arrive at the configuration shown in Fig. 5b where the position of z is not fixed. Edges (u, z) and (w_1, z) belong to T_{f_1} but at least one has three crossings, e.g. edge (u, z) in Fig. 5b. \square

For the second subcase, where $T_1 = T_e$, Property 2.3 assures that T_1 and T_2 share only vertices v_2 and w_2 , as otherwise $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1 = T_e, T_2\}$ would be bad. As indicated by the next lemma, no further restrictions (imposed by the assumption that \mathcal{T}' is not bad) are needed to prove that $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$ is bad.

Lemma 4.9 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$. Assume that T_1 is face-disjoint from T , that T_2 shares faces f and f_2 with T , and $T_e = T_1$. If T_2 has exactly two common vertices with T_1 , then \mathcal{T} is bad.*

Sketch. Assuming that \mathcal{T} is not bad, we obtain the configuration in Fig. 5c. Here, two facial 5-cliques have three common vertices contradicting Property 2.3. \square

In the following two lemmas, we summarize our findings from this section.

Lemma 4.10 (*). *Let G be optimal 2-planar and let $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$. \mathcal{T} is not bad if and only if every set $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$ is bad.*

Sketch. As G is optimal 2-planar, at least one of \mathcal{T} or $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$ for some triplets T_1 and T_2 is not bad. If \mathcal{T} is bad, the lemma holds. For the reverse direction, assume there is a set $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$ that is not bad, i.e. none of Lemmas 4.3, 4.5 and 4.7 applies for $\mathcal{T}' \cup \{T_e\}$. If \mathcal{T} is not bad from the corresponding Lemmas 4.4, 4.6 and 4.8, the conditions of Lemma 4.9 are satisfied and \mathcal{T} is bad. \square

Lemma 4.11 (*). *Let G be optimal 2-planar and let $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$. \mathcal{T} is bad if and only if the conditions of at least one of Lemmas 4.4, 4.6, 4.8 and 4.9 are met.*

Sketch. For a contradiction we assume that \mathcal{T} is bad. Since G is optimal 2-planar, by Lemma 4.10, there exists a set $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$ that is not bad. We go through all lemmas and check their conditions. For all the cases, we argue that if the specific lemma can not apply on \mathcal{T} , then \mathcal{T}' is bad. \square

5 The Recognition and Embedding Algorithm

Now that we have all required ingredients, we are ready to state our main theorem for the recognition of optimal 2-planar graphs.

Theorem 1. *Let G be a simple graph on n vertices. It can be decided in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time whether G is optimal 2-planar. If the instance is positive, an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G is reported.*

The remainder of this section contains the proof of Theorem 1 which is split into two parts. In Section 5.1 we describe our algorithm and prove its correctness, while an efficient implementation is discussed in Section 5.2.

5.1 Recognition Algorithm

Our recognition algorithm is formalized in Algorithm 1. There are four main steps in the process. The first step is the classification of all edges of G as potentially planar and clearly crossing (line 1). Second, is the identification of the CROSS-BAT instances and the creation of G_p and its planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R}_p (lines 2–10). Third, we identify all triplets of \mathcal{R}_p (line 11). Finally, we decide which of the triplets are not bad (lines 12–13) determining an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G if one exists. Having the set of triplets that are facial 5-cliques in any \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G , we decide if G is optimal 2-planar (lines 14–15) and compute an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G if it exists (line 16). The details of the steps are given in Theorem 2 in Appendix D.

5.2 Implementation

First, we check that the input graph has at most $5n - 10$ edges and that it is 9-degenerate. This process takes $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time and is described in Details 1 in Appendix D, together with standard techniques and data structures that we use. In the following, we discuss in more detail the time complexity of the involved steps of Algorithm 1. The first step of the process, described in line 1 of Algorithm 1, can be performed in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time as stated in the following lemma:

Lemma 5.1 (*). *All edges of G can be classified as potentially planar or clearly crossing in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time.*

Algorithm 1: Recognition of Simple Optimal 2-planar Graphs

Input: A 9-degenerate graph $G = (V, E)$ with $|E| = 5|V| - 10$
Output: An optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G if it exists, otherwise, **false**

- 1 Classify each edge $e \in E$ as potentially planar or clearly crossing
- 2 Identify all instances of CROSS-BAT in G and fix their partial rotation schemes
- 3 Create subgraph G_p
- 4 **if** G_p is not 3-connected or is not planar **then**
- 5 | **return false**
- 6 Compute the unique planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R}_p of G_p
- 7 **if** \mathcal{R}_p contains a face of length greater than 5
- 8 **or if** a face does not induce a complete subgraph in G **then**
- 9 | **return false**
- 10 Augment G_p to maximal planar by triangulating the faces of \mathcal{R}_p
- 11 Compute the set of triplets of \mathcal{R}_p
- 12 **for** every triplet T of \mathcal{R}_p **do**
- 13 | Label T as facial 5-clique or as non-facial 5-clique
- 14 Let \mathcal{T}^* be the set of triplets labelled as facial 5-cliques
- 15 **if** \mathcal{T}^* covers all faces of \mathcal{R}_p and all clearly crossing edges of G exactly once **then**
- 16 | **return** rotation scheme obtained by making each $T \in \mathcal{T}^*$ a facial 5-clique
- 17 **return false**

We proceed with the second step given in lines 2–10 of Algorithm 1. First, we compute the CROSS-BAT instances of G (line 2).

Lemma 5.2 (*). *All CROSS-BAT instances of G can be identified in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time if all edges are already classified as clearly crossing or potentially planar.*

For each CROSS-BAT instance, we choose the rotation scheme of Fig. 2b where (u, y) crosses (u', y') and (u, x) crosses (u', x') by reclassifying (u, y) and (u, x) as clearly crossing. We proceed with lines 3–10 of Algorithm 1. We check the necessary conditions for G_p and compute the planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R}_p and the dual G_p^* after augmenting G_p to maximal planar; see Details 2 in Appendix D.

Next, we compute the set of triplets of \mathcal{R}_p (line 11) in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time; see Details 3 in Appendix D. During this process, for each face and each clearly crossing edge of G , we store the set of triplets that contain it. The next lemma describes how to implement the labeling of each triplet as facial 5-clique or not; see line 13.

Lemma 5.3 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2$ and \mathcal{S}_e be the set of triplets containing e_1, e_2 and e , respectively. It can be decided in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time if \mathcal{T} is bad or not.*

After labeling all triplets as facial 5-cliques or non-facial 5-cliques, we consider the set \mathcal{T}^* of triplets labelled as facial 5-cliques. Checking whether \mathcal{T}^* covers all faces and clearly crossing edges of G exactly once, in line 15 of Algorithm 1, can be done in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{T}^*|) = \mathcal{O}(n)$ time. Finally, we augment the planar rotation

scheme \mathcal{R}_p of G_p to an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time by inserting the clearly crossing edges of G and identifying the crossings; refer to Details 4 in Appendix D. The overall time required for the last step is in $\mathcal{O}(n)$.

Every step described above takes time $\mathcal{O}(n)$, hence Algorithm 1 can be implemented to run in linear time. We point out that after fixing \mathcal{R}_p , the optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G is uniquely defined if it exists. In particular, if there are c instances of CROSS-BAT, there exist at most 2^c optimal 2-planar rotation schemes which can be easily enumerated.

6 Conclusions

We showed that simple optimal 2-planar graphs can be recognized and embedded in linear time. It remains open to extend our result also for simple 2-planar graphs with the maximum number of edges when $n \not\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, as well as to non-simple optimal 2-planar graphs. Another reasonable attempt would be recognizing 5-maps, similarly to [12]. Finally, a natural question would be if a recognition algorithm for non-simple optimal 2-planar graphs could be adopted for optimal 3-planar graphs that are non-simple, or if our approach could work for simple optimal 3-planar graphs.

Acknowledgement. We thank Michael Bekos for his valuable suggestions and endless discussions on this topic.

References

1. Ackerman, E.: On topological graphs with at most four crossings per edge. CoRR **1509.01932** (2015), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.01932>
2. Auer, C., Bachmaier, C., Brandenburg, F.J., Gleißner, A., Hanauer, K., Neuwirth, D., Reislhuber, J.: Outer 1-planar graphs. *Algorithmica* **74**(4), 1293–1320 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-015-0002-1>
3. Bekos, M.A., Bruckdorfer, T., Kaufmann, M., Raftopoulou, C.N.: 1-planar graphs have constant book thickness. In: Bansal, N., Finocchi, I. (eds.) *ESA*. LNCS, vol. 9294, pp. 130–141. Springer (2015), http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-48350-3_12
4. Bekos, M.A., Giacomo, E.D., Didimo, W., Liotta, G., Montecchiani, F., Raftopoulou, C.N.: Edge partitions of optimal 2-plane and 3-plane graphs. *Discret. Math.* **342**(4), 1038–1047 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2018.12.002>
5. Bekos, M.A., Kaufmann, M., Raftopoulou, C.N.: On optimal 2- and 3-planar graphs. In: Aronov, B., Katz, M.J. (eds.) *33rd International Symposium on Computational Geometry, SoCG 2017, July 4-7, 2017, Brisbane, Australia*. LIPIcs, vol. 77, pp. 16:1–16:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2017), <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.SoCG.2017.16>
6. Binucci, C., Giacomo, E.D., Didimo, W., Montecchiani, F., Patrignani, M., Symvonis, A., Tollis, I.G.: Fan-planarity: Properties and complexity. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **589**, 76–86 (2015), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2015.04.020>
7. Bodendiek, R., Schumacher, H., Wagner, K.: Über 1-optimale Graphen. *Mathematische Nachrichten* **117**(1), 323–339 (1984)

8. Borodin, O.V.: A new proof of the 6 color theorem. *J. of Graph Theory* **19**(4), 507–521 (1995), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jgt.3190190406>
9. Brandenburg, F.J.: Recognizing optimal 1-planar graphs in linear time. *CoRR* **1602.08022** (2016), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1602.08022>
10. Brandenburg, F.J.: Recognizing IC-planar and NIC-planar graphs. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.* **22**(2), 239–271 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.7155/jgaa.00466>
11. Brandenburg, F.J.: Recognizing optimal 1-planar graphs in linear time. *Algorithmica* **80**(1), 1–28 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-016-0226-8>
12. Brandenburg, F.J.: Characterizing and recognizing 4-map graphs. *Algorithmica* **81**(5), 1818–1843 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-018-0510-x>
13. Brandenburg, F.J., Didimo, W., Evans, W.S., Kindermann, P., Liotta, G., Montecchiani, F.: Recognizing and drawing IC-planar graphs. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **636**, 1–16 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2016.04.026>
14. Cheong, O., Har-Peled, S., Kim, H., Kim, H.: On the number of edges of fan-crossing free graphs. *Algorithmica* **73**(4), 673–695 (2015), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00453-014-9935-z>
15. Didimo, W., Eades, P., Liotta, G.: Drawing graphs with right angle crossings. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **412**(39), 5156–5166 (2011)
16. Dujmovic, V., Joret, G., Micek, P., Morin, P., Ueckerdt, T., Wood, D.R.: Planar graphs have bounded queue-number. *J. ACM* **67**(4), 22:1–22:38 (2020), <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3385731>
17. Eades, P., Hong, S., Katoh, N., Liotta, G., Schweitzer, P., Suzuki, Y.: A linear time algorithm for testing maximal 1-planarity of graphs with a rotation system. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **513**, 65–76 (2013), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2013.09.029>
18. Giacomo, E.D., Didimo, W., Liotta, G., Meijer, H., Wismath, S.K.: Planar and quasi-planar simultaneous geometric embedding. *Comput. J.* **58**(11), 3126–3140 (2015), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/comjnl/bxv048>
19. Hong, S., Eades, P., Katoh, N., Liotta, G., Schweitzer, P., Suzuki, Y.: A linear-time algorithm for testing outer-1-planarity. *Algorithmica* **72**(4), 1033–1054 (2015), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00453-014-9890-8>
20. Hong, S., Eades, P., Liotta, G., Poon, S.: Fáry’s theorem for 1-planar graphs. In: Gudmundsson, J., Mestre, J., Viglas, T. (eds.) *COCOON*. LNCS, vol. 7434, pp. 335–346. Springer (2012), http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-32241-9_29
21. Hong, S., Nagamochi, H.: A linear-time algorithm for testing full outer-2-planarity. *Discret. Appl. Math.* **255**, 234–257 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2018.08.018>
22. Hopcroft, J.E., Tarjan, R.E.: Dividing a graph into triconnected components. *SIAM J. Comput.* **2**(3), 135–158 (1973), <https://doi.org/10.1137/0202012>
23. Hopcroft, J.E., Tarjan, R.E.: Efficient planarity testing. *J. ACM* **21**(4), 549–568 (1974), <https://doi.org/10.1145/321850.321852>
24. Kaufmann, M., Ueckerdt, T.: The density of fan-planar graphs. *CoRR* **1403.6184** (2014), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1403.6184>
25. Matula, D.W., Beck, L.L.: Smallest-last ordering and clustering and graph coloring algorithms. *J. ACM* **30**(3), 417–427 (1983), <https://doi.org/10.1145/2402.322385>
26. Pach, J., Radoicic, R., Tardos, G., Tóth, G.: Improving the crossing lemma by finding more crossings in sparse graphs. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **36**(4), 527–552 (2006), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00454-006-1264-9>
27. Pach, J., Tóth, G.: Graphs drawn with few crossings per edge. *Combinatorica* **17**(3), 427–439 (1997), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01215922>

28. Ringel, G.: Ein Sechsfarbenproblem auf der Kugel. *Abhandlungen aus dem Mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg* (in German) **29**, 107–117 (1965)
29. Suzuki, Y.: Re-embeddings of maximum 1-planar graphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **24**(4), 1527–1540 (2010), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/090746835>
30. Urschel, J.C., Wellens, J.: Testing gap k -planarity is NP-complete. *Inf. Process. Lett.* **169**, 106083 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipl.2020.106083>

A Omitted Proofs from Section 2

Corollary 2.1 (*). *For two edges (u, v) and (u, w) of an optimal 2-planar graph G let $S = N(u, v) \cup N(u, w) \cup \{u, v, w\}$. If $|S| < 8$, then (u, v) and (u, w) belong to the same facial 5-clique in any optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G .*

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that (u, v) and (u, w) belong to two different facial 5-cliques C and C' of an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R} of G , respectively. Since $C \subseteq N(u, v)$ and $C' \subseteq N(u, w)$, it follows that $C \cup C' \subseteq S$ and thus $|C \cup C'| < 8$. Since $|C| = |C'| = 5$, it follows that $|C \cap C'| > 2$; contradiction to Property 2.3. Hence, (u, v) and (u, w) belong to the same facial 5-clique. \square

B Omitted Proofs from Section 3

Lemma 3.1 (*). *Let \mathcal{R} be an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G and let $C = \langle c_0, \dots, c_4 \rangle$ be a facial 5-clique in \mathcal{R} such that (c_1, c_3) and (c_2, c_4) are potentially planar edges. Then, vertices c_2 and c_3 have degree 9 in G , and the induced subgraph H of G with vertex set $V(H) = N(c_2) \cup N(c_3)$ is an instance of CROSS-BAT where C is the 5-clique $\langle v, x', u', u, x \rangle$ of Fig. 2a.*

Proof. Since (c_1, c_3) is potentially planar, vertices c_1 and c_3 have at least six common neighbors. Out of these common neighbors, exactly three belong to C (namely, c_0, c_2 and c_4). It follows that at least three of the common neighbors of c_1 and c_3 , call them u, v and w , do not belong to C ; see Fig. 6a. By Corollary 2.2, the edges connecting c_1 to u, v and w do not cross the edges that connect c_3 to u, v and w in \mathcal{R} . Assume w.l.o.g. that $c_1, c_2, u, v, w, c_4, c_0$ appear in this circular order around c_3 in \mathcal{R} ; see Fig. 6a.

A symmetric argument for c_2 and c_4 implies the existence of three common neighbors x, y and z of c_2 and c_4 that do not belong to C . Since C is a facial 5-clique, vertices x, y, z appear between c_3 and c_0 in the circular order around c_4 in \mathcal{R} . In particular, we can assume w.l.o.g. that vertices $c_2, c_3, x, y, z, c_0, c_1$ occur in this order around c_4 in \mathcal{R} . Note that x, y and z are not necessarily different from u, v and w . In particular, we will prove in the following that $|\{u, v, w\} \cap \{x, y, z\}| = 2$.

Proposition 3.1.1. *None of the edges (c_4, x) , (c_4, y) and (c_4, z) crosses (c_1, w) .*

Proof. Assume that edge (c_4, x) crosses (c_1, w) as in Fig. 6b. This contradicts Corollary 2.2, since (c_1, c_4) is a crossing edge inside C while edges (c_4, x) and (c_1, w) do not belong to C . A symmetric argument applies for edges (c_4, y) and (c_4, z) . \square

Proposition 3.1.2. *None of vertices $\{x, y, z\}$ lies in the interior of the region delimited by the cycle (c_3, w, c_1, c_0, c_4) .*




Fig. 6: (a) Vertices c_1, c_3 have three common neighbors $\{u, v, w\}$ outside C . (b) Illustration for Proposition 3.1.1. (c) Illustration for Proposition 3.1.2. (d) Illustration for Proposition 3.1.3. (e) Illustration for Proposition 3.1.4. (f) Summary of constraints imposed by Propositions 3.1.1–3.1.4.

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that vertex z lies in the interior of this region (refer to the gray-shaded region in Fig. 6c); an analogous argument holds for x and y . Then, edge (c_2, z) crosses at least three edges, in particular, one edge of (c_1, u) and (c_3, u) , one edge of (c_1, v) and (c_3, v) , and one edge of (c_1, w) and (c_3, w) ; a contradiction to the fact that \mathcal{R} is a optimal 2-planar rotation scheme. \square

Proposition 3.1.3. $w \notin \{x, y\}$ and edges (c_4, x) and (c_4, y) cross edge (c_3, w) .

Proof. Assume for a contradiction, that $w = y$; an analogous argument holds if we assume $w = x$. Since y, z and c_0 appear in this circular order around c_4 in \mathcal{R} and since, by Proposition 3.1.1, edge (c_4, z) does not cross (c_1, w) , vertex z is located in the region delimited by the cycle $(c_4, w = y, c_1, c_0)$; see Fig. 6d. This contradicts Proposition 3.1.2, and hence $w \notin \{x, y\}$.

Now, since C is a facial 5-clique, by Proposition 3.1.2, vertices x and y must be in the interior of the region delimited by the cycle (c_3, c_2, c_1, w) . Hence,




Fig. 7: (a)–(b) Illustrations for Proposition 3.1.5. (c) Summary of constraints imposed by Propositions 3.1.1–3.1.5.

each of edges (c_4, x) and (c_4, y) crosses either (c_3, w) or (c_1, w) . However, by Proposition 3.1.1, the two edges must cross (c_3, w) as claimed. \square

Proposition 3.1.4. $z = w$.

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that $z \neq w$. By Proposition 3.1.2, it follows that z lies in the interior of the region delimited by the cycle (c_3, c_2, c_1, w) . By Proposition 3.1.1, it follows that (c_4, z) crosses edge (c_3, w) . However, by Proposition 3.1.3, (c_3, w) is also crossed by (c_4, x) and (c_4, y) as in Fig. 6e; a contradiction to 2-planarity. \square

The constraints discussed so far lead to the configuration shown in Fig. 6f. Since $z = w$ is a common neighbor of c_2 and c_4 , we turn our attention to edge $(c_2, z) = (c_2, w)$. We prove the following:

Proposition 3.1.5. *Edge (c_2, z) crosses (c_1, u) and (c_1, v) and $\langle c_2, c_1, z, v, u \rangle$ is a facial 5-clique.*

Proof. By the circular order of edges around c_1 and c_3 , edge (c_2, z) must cross one of edges (c_1, u) and (c_3, u) as well as one of edges (c_1, v) and (c_3, v) . First we prove that it must either cross (c_1, u) and (c_1, v) or (c_3, u) and (c_3, v) . Indeed if (c_2, z) crosses (c_1, u) and (c_3, v) as in Fig. 7a (the case where (c_2, z) crosses (c_1, v) and (c_3, u) is symmetric), edge (c_2, z) is crossed by two independent edges, contradicting Property 2.2.

It remains to prove that (c_2, z) does not cross edges (c_3, u) and (c_3, v) . Assume the contrary; see Fig. 7b. Then, by Property 2.2, $\langle c_3, c_2, u, v, z \rangle$ is a facial 5-clique with (c_3, z) being one of its crossing-free boundary edges. However, by Proposition 3.1.3 edges (c_4, x) and (c_4, y) cross with edge (c_3, z) , as $w = z$; a contradiction. We conclude that (c_2, z) crosses (c_1, u) and (c_1, v) forming the facial 5-clique $\langle c_2, c_1, z, v, u \rangle$. \square




Fig. 8: (a) Illustration for Proposition 3.1.6. (b) Illustration for Proposition 3.1.8. (c) Summary of constraints imposed by Propositions 3.1.1–3.1.8.

To summarize so far, Propositions 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 imply that vertices x and y lie in the interior of the region delimited by the cycle $(c_3, c_4, c_0, c_1, z = w)$. Since $\langle c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 \rangle$ and $\langle c_2, c_1, z, v, u \rangle$ are facial 5-cliques, we can further restrict x and y in the interior of the region delimited by the cycle (c_3, c_2, u, v, z) ; see Fig. 7c. In the following proposition, we restrict x and y even more.

Proposition 3.1.6. *Neither x nor y lies in the interior of the region delimited by the cycle (c_3, v, z) .*

Proof. Assume to the contrary that vertex x lies in the interior of the region delimited by the cycle (c_3, v, z) ; an analogous argument applies for y . Then, edge (c_2, x) crosses (c_3, v) ; see Fig. 8a. This contradicts Corollary 2.2, since (c_2, v) is a crossing edge in the facial 5-clique $\langle c_2, c_1, z, v, u \rangle$. \square

Proposition 3.1.7. *$v \neq x$ and edge (c_4, x) crosses (c_3, v) .*

Proof. First assume for a contradiction that $v = x$. Due to circular order of the edges around c_4 , vertex y can only be located in the interior of the region delimited by the cycle (c_3, v, z) . This contradicts Proposition 3.1.6. Hence $v \neq x$. The crossing between (c_4, x) and (c_3, v) is imposed by Proposition 3.1.6. \square

Proposition 3.1.8. *$v = y$.*

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that $v \neq y$. By Propositions 3.1.6 and 3.1.7, it follows that both edges (c_4, x) and (c_4, y) cross both of (c_3, z) and (c_3, v) ; see Fig. 8b. Then, by Property 2.1, the six vertices c_4, c_3, x, y, v, z must form a facial 5-clique; a contradiction. \square

The constraints imposed by Propositions 3.1.1–3.1.8 imply the configuration shown in Fig. 8c. It remains to decide whether $u = x$ or if u is located in the interior of cycle (c_3, u, y) .




Fig. 9: (a) Illustration for Proposition 3.1.9. (b) Summary of constraints imposed by Propositions 3.1.1–3.1.9. (c) The crossing between (c_3, u) and (c_2, x) implies the facial 5-clique $\langle x, c_3, c_2, u, x' \rangle$.

Proposition 3.1.9. $x \neq u$.

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that $x = u$. Recall from Proposition 3.1.3 that edge (c_4, x) crosses edge (c_3, z) ; see Fig. 9a. Consider now edge (z, x) which is part of the facial 5-clique $\langle c_2, c_1, z, y, x \rangle$. By Corollary 2.2, edge (c_4, x) is not allowed to cross edge (c_3, z) , which however is the case; a contradiction. \square

By Proposition 3.1.7 and by 2-planarity, we conclude that x is located inside the cycle (c_3, u, y) ; see Fig. 9b. Since by Propositions 3.1.3 and 3.1.7, edge (c_4, x) crosses with edges (c_3, w) and (c_3, v) , respectively, it follows by Property 2.2 that $\langle c_3, x, y, z, c_4 \rangle$ is a facial 5-clique. In addition, (c_4, z) is a crossing-free edge on the boundary of this facial 5-clique.

Now, since edges (c_2, x) and (c_3, u) cross, they belong to a facial 5-clique that contains vertices c_3, c_2, u, x . Let x' be the last vertex of this facial 5-clique. It must be $x' \neq y$ since edge (c_3, y) is a crossing edge inside the facial 5-clique $\langle c_3, x, y, z, c_4 \rangle$.

The final configuration is depicted in Fig. 9c. Vertices c_2 and c_3 have degree nine in G , with eight common neighbors $N(c_2) \cap N(c_3) = \{c_0, c_1, c_4, u, v, w, x, x'\}$. Let H be the subgraph induced by the vertex set $V(H) = N(c_2) \cup N(c_3)$. Since cycles (c_0, c_4, z, c_1) and (x, x', u, y) are crossing-free cycles and since the two edges (c_1, c_4) and (x, u) are already part of a facial 5-clique, H contains only the edges of the four identified facial 5-cliques and possibly one or both of edges (c_0, z) and (x', y) .

Consider a relabeling of the vertices of H based on the following table:

Figure 9c	c_0	c_1	c_2	c_3	c_4	u	$v = y$	$w = z$	x	x'
G_{CB}	v	x'	u'	u	x	y'	w'	v'	y	w

We obtain the CROSS-BAT substructure of Fig. 2a where C is the facial 5-clique $\langle v, x', u', u, x \rangle$ as claimed. Since the boundaries of the four identified facial 5-cliques are crossing-free in \mathcal{R} , we can easily verify that the edges of H are classified to clearly crossing and potentially planar according to the definition of CROSS-BAT; see also Fig. 2a. \square

Lemma 3.2 (*). *Any instance of CROSS-BAT in an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R} has one of the two rotation schemes shown in Figs. 2b and 2c.*

Proof. Consider an instance H of CROSS-BAT in \mathcal{R} . In the following, we use the naming of vertices according to Fig. 2a for the vertices of H . First we prove that the four 5-cliques of H are always facial 5-cliques of \mathcal{R} .

Proposition 3.2.1. *Edges (u, v) and (u', v) belong to the same facial 5-clique C_v in \mathcal{R} with $V(C_v) \setminus \{u, u', v\} \subset \{x, x', v'\}$. Also, edges (u, w) and (u', w) belong to another facial 5-clique C_w with $V(C_w) \setminus \{u, u', w\} \subset \{y, y', w'\}$.*

Proof. By definition, vertices u and u' have degree 9 in G and $V(H) = N(u) \cup N(v)$. In particular $N(u) = V(H) \setminus \{u\}$ and $N(u') = V(H) \setminus \{u'\}$. On the other hand, the neighborhood of v in H consists of u, u', x and x' (which form a 5-clique with v) and potentially v' (if the edge (v, v') exists). We conclude that $N(u, v) \subseteq \{u', x, x', v'\}$, and $N(u', v) \subseteq \{u, x, x', v'\}$. Then $N(u, v) \cup N(u', v) \setminus \{u, u'\} \subseteq \{x, x', v'\}$. By Corollary 2.1, it follows that (u, v) and (u', v) belong to the same facial 5-clique C_v . The vertex set of C_v contains vertices u, u' and v , and two vertices from $\{x, x', v'\}$. By symmetry, the same holds for edges (u, w) and (u', w) , that is, they belong to the same facial 5-clique C_w , whose vertex set contains vertices u, u', w , and two vertices from $\{y, y', w'\}$. \square

Proposition 3.2.2. *Let $\{u_1, u_2\} = \{u, u'\}$. Edges (y, x) , (y, v') and (x, w') belong to a facial 5-clique $C_{x,y} = \langle u_1, y, w', v', x \rangle$ in \mathcal{R} . Also, edges (y', x') and (y', v') and (x', w') belong to another facial 5-clique $C_{x',y'} = \langle u_2, x', v', w', y' \rangle$.*

Proof. Consider edge (y, x) . Since (y, x) is clearly crossing it belongs to a facial 5-clique $C_{x,y}$ of \mathcal{R} . We have that $N(y, x) = \{u, u', v', w'\}$. By Proposition 3.2.1, the edge (u, u') belongs to two facial 5-cliques, that contain vertices v and w respectively. Since $N(y, x)$ contains neither v nor w , it follows that $C_{x,y}$ contains exactly one of u or u' . Then $V(C_{x,y}) = \{x, y, u_1, v', w'\}$, where $u_1 \in \{u, u'\}$. Hence all three edges (y, x) and (y, v') and (x, w') belong to the same facial 5-clique, namely $C_{x,y}$. By symmetry, edges (y', x') and (y', v') and (x', w') belong to another facial 5-clique $C_{x',y'}$ where $V(C_{x',y'}) = \{x', y', u_2, v', w'\}$ and $u_2 \in \{u, u'\}$. It remains to argue that $u_1 \neq u_2$. Recall that vertices u and u' have degree nine in G and therefore belong to three facial 5-cliques in \mathcal{R} . Already, by Proposition 3.2.1 we have identified two facial 5-cliques. Clearly if $u_1 = u_2 = u$, vertex u would belong to two more facial 5-cliques, namely $C_{x,y}$ and $C_{x',y'}$, that is a total of four facial 5-cliques. \square

As initially mentioned, we identified four facial 5-cliques, C_v , C_w , $C_{x,y}$ and $C_{x',y'}$. Recall that C_v contains two vertices from $\{x, x', v'\}$. We show now, that C_v does not contain v' . Assume for a contradiction that C_v contains v' and w.l.o.g. vertex x . Then $V(C_v) \cap V(C_{x,y}) = \{u_1, x, v'\}$; a contradiction to Property 2.3. Hence, C_v contains both x and x' . Analogously, C_w contains both of y and y' .

By Proposition 3.2.2, $C_{y,x}$ and $C_{y',x'}$ are two facial 5-cliques that share the crossing-free edge (v', w') . Moreover, by Property 2.4, edge $(u_1, u_2) = (u, u')$ is crossing-free as it belongs to the two facial 5-cliques C_v and C_w by Proposition 3.2.1; refer to Figs. 2b and 2c. Hence, w is contained in the crossing-free separating cycle (u_1, u_2, y', w', y) while v is contained in the crossing-free separating cycle (u_2, u_1, x, v', x') . Since (u_1, w) and (u_2, w) are clearly crossing, edges (w, y) and (w, y') are on the boundary of C_w , the same holds for edges (v, x) and (v, x') being on the boundary of C_v . Now, by selecting $u_1 = u$ or $u_1 = u'$, we yield the two different embeddings of Figs. 2b and 2c. \square

Lemma 3.4 (*). *Let \mathcal{R} be an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G . If G contains an instance H of CROSS-BAT, then there exist exactly two pairs of potentially planar edges that belong to H and cross in \mathcal{R} .*

Proof. By Lemma 3.3, we can assume w.l.o.g. that H has the rotation scheme of CROSS-BAT shown in Fig. 2b in \mathcal{R} . Then, it is not hard to see that edges (u', x') and (u, x) are potentially planar and cross each other. The same holds for edges (u', y') and (u, y) . It is evident that no other pair of potentially planar edges that belong to H cross. \square

C Omitted Proofs from Section 4

Lemma 4.1 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$. If none of T_1 and T_2 is face-disjoint from T , then \mathcal{T}' is bad.*

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that \mathcal{T}' is not bad. In $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$, edge e_1 is assigned to T_1 and edge e_2 to T_2 . By the assumptions of the lemma, none of T_1 and T_2 is face-disjoint from T (i.e., Case C.1 applies neither for T_1 nor for T_2). We consider two cases, depending on whether Case C.3 applies for one of T_1 and T_2 or Case C.2 applies for both T_1 and T_2 .

First, consider the case where w.l.o.g. T_1 shares faces f and f_1 with T (i.e., Case C.3 applies for T_1); the reasoning for T_2 is symmetric. We claim that T_2 is face-disjoint from T , contradicting our assumption that none of T_1 and T_2 is face-disjoint from T . Indeed, T_2 cannot share faces f and f_2 with T , as otherwise e_1 and e_2 cross each other in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$ and thus T_1 and T_2 would be identical with T . On the other hand, if T_2 contains face f_1 (which is also contained in T_1), then it follows that T_1 , T_2 and T coincide; a contradiction. Hence, T_2 is necessarily face-disjoint with T , contradicting our assumption that Case C.1 does not apply for T_2 .

Second, consider the case where Case C.2 applies for both T_1 and T_2 , that is, for $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\}$ triplet T_i shares only face f_j with T . Clearly $T_1 \neq T_2$. In




Fig. 10: Illustration for the proof of Lemma 4.2.

particular, in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$ the facial 5-clique formed by T_1 contains vertices u, v_2, w_2 (the three vertices of face f_2) and vertex v_1 (which is endpoint of edge e_1). Similarly, in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$ the facial 5-clique formed by T_2 contains vertices u, v_1, w_1, v_2 . Hence, the two facial 5-cliques share three vertices; a contradiction to Property 2.3. This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.2 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$. If both T_1 and T_2 are face-disjoint from T , then \mathcal{T}' is bad.*

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that \mathcal{T}' is not bad, and each of T_1 and T_2 is face-disjoint from T . Recall that in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$ edge e_1 is assigned to T_1 and edge e_2 to T_2 , where $T_1 = T_2$ might hold. Since \mathcal{T}' is not bad, $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$ can be extended to an \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R}' of G . This implies that there exists (at least) one triplet T_f that contains face f , such that $\mathcal{T}' \cup \{T_f\}$ is not bad. If T_f contains f_1 , then by Observation 4.2 edge e_1 is assigned to T_f , i.e., $T_f = T_1$. This contradicts our assumption that T_1 is face-disjoint with T . Hence, T_f does not contain f_1 . Similarly, we argue that T_f does not contain f_2 .

By the assumptions of the lemma, T_1 and T_2 are face-disjoint from T . Thus, in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$ both edges e_1 and e_2 are drawn outside the faces of T , which implies that they cross each other. Let u, w_2, x_2, x_1 and w_1 be the vertices of T_f as shown in Fig. 10. Now edge (w_1, w_2) is a crossing edge of the facial 5-clique formed by T_f in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$, which, by Corollary 2.2, implies that e_1 and e_2 do not cross each other; a contradiction. \square

Lemma 4.3 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$, such that T_1 is face-disjoint from T and T_2 shares only face f_1 with T . For $u \in V(T)$, if (i) $d(u) > 9$, or, (ii) for every vertex $x \in S = N(u) \setminus V(T)$ it holds $|N(x) \cap S| \geq 2$, then \mathcal{T}' is bad.*

Proof. Assume that \mathcal{T}' is not bad. Then $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$ can be extended to a \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R}' of G . Consider the facial 5-cliques of T_1 and T_2 in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$. Since the boundary edges of facial 5-cliques are crossing-free and T_2 shares only face f_1 with T , edge e_2 must cross edge (v_1, u) ; see Fig. 11. T_2 contains vertices v_1, w_1, u (since these are vertices of f_1) and vertex v_2 (as an endpoint of edge e_2). Let z be the last vertex of T_2 . If $z \in V(T)$ then $T_2 = T$ by




Fig. 11: Illustration for the proof of Lemma 4.3.

Observation 4.1, contradicting the assumption that T_2 shares only face f_1 with T . Since edges e and e_2 are both incident to v_2 and are crossing edges in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$, edges (v_2, z) and (v_2, u) are crossing-free. Similarly, edges (v_1, z) and (v_1, w_1) are crossing-free. Hence, the facial 5-clique of T_2 is $\langle w_1, v_1, z, v_2, u \rangle$; see Fig 11.

Let T_f and T_3 be the triplets that faces f and f_2 are assigned to w.r.t. \mathcal{R}' . It must be the case that $T_f \neq T_3$ as otherwise, T_f would contain faces f and f_2 of T and, as a consequence, edge e_2 . Then T_f would be identical to T_2 contradicting the fact that T_2 shares only face f_1 with T . Hence we conclude that there exist triplets T_f and T_3 such that $\mathcal{T}' \cup \{T_f, T_3\}$ is not bad. Observe that u is surrounded by the three facial 5-cliques formed by T_2 , T_f and T_3 in \mathcal{R}' , that pair-wise share an uncrossed edge incident to u . This implies that $d(u) = 9$. Hence, if $d(u) > 9$, then \mathcal{T}' is bad as stated in the lemma. It remains to prove that there is a vertex $x \in S = N(u) \setminus V(T)$ with $|N(x) \cap S| < 2$.

The facial 5-cliques formed by triplets T_f and T_3 share vertices u and w_2 , thus, by Property 2.4, edge (u, w_2) is crossing-free in \mathcal{R}' . Similarly, T_2 and T_3 share vertices u and v_2 , while T_2 and T_f share vertices u and w_1 . Hence, edges (u, v_2) and (u, w_1) are also crossing-free in \mathcal{R}' .

Thus, the facial 5-clique formed by T_f is bounded by the crossing-free 5-cycle (u, w_2, x_2, x_1, w_1) while the facial 5-clique formed by T_3 is bounded by the crossing-free 5-cycle (u, v_2, y_2, y_1, w_2) where $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \notin V(T)$; see Fig 11. Observe that since T_f and T_3 share vertices u and w_2 we can conclude that $\{x_1, x_2\} \cap \{y_1, y_2\} = \emptyset$ by Property 2.3. Similarly, each of T_f and T_3 shares two vertices with T_2 , thus $z \notin \{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\}$.

Since triplets T_1 and T_f share vertex w_2 , at least one vertex among x_1 and x_2 , say x_1 , does not belong to T_1 by Property 2.3. Let $S = N(u) \setminus V(T) = \{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, z\}$. We claim that $|N(x_1) \cap S| \leq 1$. Since T_1 is a facial 5-clique in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$, there exist two crossing-free paths P_1 and P'_1 that connect v_1 and w_2 . Assume w.l.o.g. that the edges of P_1 and P'_1 incident to v_1 appear in this order

and between edges (v_1, w_1) and (v_1, z) in the circular order of edges around v_1 ⁴; refer to Fig. 11. The cycle (w_2, P_1, v_1, w_1, u) is crossing-free in \mathcal{R}' . Since x_1 lies in the interior of this cycle, while vertices z , y_1 and y_2 lie in its exterior, it follows that vertex x_1 is not adjacent to vertices z , y_1 or y_2 , i.e., x_1 is adjacent only to vertex x_2 of S .

To summarize, assuming that \mathcal{T}' is not bad, vertex u has degree nine and there exists at least one neighbor of u that does not belong to $V(T)$, namely x_1 , such that $|N(x_1) \cap S| \leq 1$. The lemma follows. \square

Lemma 4.4 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$ and let $v \in V(T)$ such that $d(v) = 9$. If there exists a vertex $x \in S = N(v) \setminus V(T)$ such that $|N(x) \cap S| \leq 1$, then \mathcal{T} is bad.*

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that \mathcal{T} is not bad. Let \mathcal{R} be a \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G that extends $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}}$. In \mathcal{R} , the triplet T_x that contains edge (v, x) contains three more neighbors of v . Since $|N(x) \cap S| \leq 1$, T_x contains at least two vertices from $V(T) \setminus \{v\}$, contradicting Property 2.3. \square

Lemma 4.5 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2, T_e\}$, such that T_1 is face-disjoint from T , T_2 shares faces f and f_2 with T , and T_e is face-disjoint from T_1 . Then:*

- If T_1 contains vertex w_1 of T and additionally (i) $d(w_1) > 9$, or, (ii) there is a vertex $x \in S = N(w_1) \setminus V(T)$ such that $|N(x) \cap S| \geq 4$, then \mathcal{T}' is bad.
- If T_e contains vertex u of T and additionally (i) $d(u) > 9$, or, (ii) there is a vertex $x \in S = N(u) \setminus V(T)$ such that $|N(x) \cap S| \geq 4$, then \mathcal{T}' is bad.

Proof. Assume that \mathcal{T}' is not bad and that T_1 contains vertex w_1 . Then $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$ can be extended to a \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R}' of G . Since e_1 belongs to T_1 , it follows that T_1 also contains vertices v_1 and w_2 of T . Let x_1 and x_2 be the other two vertices of T_1 . First we claim that neither x_1 nor x_2 is a vertex of T . Assume the contrary, say for x_1 . Then, x_1 is either vertex u or vertex v_2 of T . If x_1 is vertex u , then by Observation 4.1, triplet T_1 would contain face f_1 of T contradicting the assumption that T_1 is face-disjoint with T . On the other hand, if x_1 is vertex v_2 , then T_1 would contain edge e_2 , contradicting the fact that T_1 is different from T_2 .

Now, consider a counter-clockwise walk around the boundary of the facial 5-clique formed by T_1 in G_p . If edge (v_1, w_1) is not on the boundary of T_1 , then face f_1 would belong to T_1 ; a contradiction to the fact that T_1 is face-disjoint with T . Similarly, (w_1, w_2) is also on the boundary of T_1 , since face f does not belong to T_1 . This implies that vertices v_1 , w_1 and w_2 appear consecutively along the boundary of T_1 , followed by vertices x_1 and x_2 .

Recall that w.r.t. $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$ edges e_1 , e_2 and e are assigned to T_1 , T_2 and T_e respectively, as shown in Fig. 12. Note that f_1 is not contained in any of T_1 , T_2 or T_e . Let T_3 be the triplet that forms the facial 5-clique of \mathcal{R}' where f_1 belongs to. Since \mathcal{T}' is not bad, we conclude that $\mathcal{T}' \cup \{T_3\}$ is also not bad. Observe that w_1 is surrounded by the three facial 5-cliques formed by T_1 , T_2 and T_3 in \mathcal{R}' , that

⁴ It might be that the edge of P_1 incident to v_1 coincides with (v_1, w_1) or that the edge of P'_1 incident to v_1 coincides with (v_1, z) .




Fig. 12: Illustration for the proof of Lemma 4.5.

pair-wise share an uncrossed edge incident to w_1 . Thus, vertex w_1 is a degree-9 vertex. Clearly, if $d(w_1) > 9$, \mathcal{T}' is bad as stated in the lemma. It remains to prove that there is no vertex $x \in S = N(w_1) \setminus V(T)$ with $|N(x) \cap S| \geq 4$.

By the assumptions of the lemma, triplet T_2 contains faces f and f_2 of T , hence it contains vertices w_1, w_2, u and v_2 of T . Let z be the last vertex of T_2 , which is different from v_1 . Now, along the boundary of T_3 vertices u, w_1 and v_1 appear consecutively, followed by two more vertices $y_1, y_2 \notin V(T)$ that are different from vertices x_1, x_2 and z . Hence the neighbors of w_1 in circular order are $\{v_1, y_1, y_2, u, z, v_2, w_2, x_1, x_2\}$ or $\{v_1, y_1, y_2, u, v_2, z, w_2, x_1, x_2\}$ depending on whether vertex z appears before of after vertex v_2 . Let $S = \{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, z\}$ be the set of neighbors of w_1 that do not belong to T . We claim that every vertex of S has at most 3 neighbors in S .

Recall that the boundary edges of the facial 5-cliques in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}' \cup \{T_3\}}$ are crossing-free. Since T_e is a facial 5-clique in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}' \cup \{T_3\}}$, it follows that there exist two crossing-free paths P_e and P'_e that connect vertices v_1 and v_2 . Assume w.l.o.g. that the edges of P'_e and P_e incident to v_1 appear in this order and between edges (v_1, x_2) and (v_1, y_1) in the circular order of edges around v_1 ⁵; refer to Fig. 12. Then P_e along with the crossing-free path v_2, u, w_1, v_1 forms a crossing-free cycle in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}' \cup \{T_3\}}$. Vertex y_2 lies in the interior of this cycle (note that y_1 might be a vertex of this cycle), while vertex x_1 lies in its exterior. Thus, x_1 and y_2 can't be adjacent vertices. Also, any other vertex of S can be adjacent to at most one of x_1 and y_2 , proving the claim. To summarize, assuming that \mathcal{T}' is not bad, and that vertex w_1 has degree nine, we conclude that for every neighbor x of w_1 in S it holds $|N(x) \cap S| \leq 3$, proving the first part of the lemma. The case where \mathcal{T}' is not bad and T_e contains vertex u is symmetric. \square

Lemma 4.6 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$ and let $v \in V(T)$ with $d(v) = 9$. If for every vertex $x \in S = N(v) \setminus V(T)$ it holds $|N(x) \cap S| \leq 3$, then \mathcal{T} is bad.*

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that \mathcal{T} is not bad. Thus there is a \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R} of G that extends $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}}$. In \mathcal{R} , the neighbors

⁵ It might be that the edge of P'_e incident to v_1 coincides with (v_1, x_2) or that the edge of P_e incident to v_1 coincides with (v_1, y_1) .

of v belong to three facial 5-cliques, one of them being T . Let T' and T'' be two other facial 5-cliques which include v so that T' and T'' share vertices v and $c \neq v$. Clearly, $c \in S$, and $|N(v) \cap N(c)| \geq 6$. Since each of T' and T'' can contain at most one vertex of T different from v , this implies that c must be adjacent to at least 4 vertices of S ; a contradiction. \square

Lemma 4.7 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2, T_e\}$, such that T_1 is face-disjoint from T , T_2 shares faces f and f_2 with T , and T_e is face-disjoint from T_1 . Assume that T_1 does not contain vertex w_1 and T_e does not contain vertex u of T . If there is no triplet T_{f_1} that contains f_1 such that (i) T_{f_1} shares only vertices of f_1 with T , and, (ii) T_{f_1} is face-disjoint from all of T_1, T_2 and T_e , then \mathcal{T}' is bad.*

Proof. Assume that \mathcal{T}' is not bad, i.e. there exists a \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R}' of G that extends $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$. By assumption, T_2 shares only faces f and f_2 with T in \mathcal{R}' . In \mathcal{R}' , face f_1 is part of a facial 5-clique formed by a triplet T_{f_1} which is necessarily face-disjoint from all of T_1, T_2 and T_e . Since f_1 already shares vertices u and w_1 with the facial 5-clique formed by T_2 , triplet T_{f_1} contains neither vertex v_2 nor w_2 of T , i.e. T_{f_1} shares only the three vertices of f_1 with T . The lemma follows. \square

Lemma 4.8 (*). *Let triplets T_1, T_2, T_e be pairwise disjoint such that T_1 is face-disjoint from T , T_2 shares faces f and f_2 with T , T_e is face-disjoint from T_1 , T_1 does not contain vertex w_1 and T_e does not contain vertex u of T . If there is a triplet T_{f_1} that contains f_1 such that (i) T_{f_1} shares only vertices of f_1 with T , and, (ii) T_{f_1} is face-disjoint from all of T_1, T_2 and T_e , then $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$ is bad.*

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that \mathcal{T} is not bad. The boundary of triplet T_1 consists of two paths in \mathcal{R}_p , say P_1 and P'_1 , that connect vertices v_1 and w_2 . Similarly, the boundary of T_e consists of two paths in \mathcal{R}_p , say P_e and P'_e , that connect vertices v_1 and v_2 . Note that P_1 and P'_1 are edge-disjoint. The same holds for paths P_e and P'_e . Assume w.l.o.g. that in the counter-clockwise order of edges around v_1 , we encounter the edges of P_1, P'_1, P'_e and P_e incident to v_1 in this order between edges (v_1, w_1) and (v_1, u) ; see Fig. 13. Thus, P_1 and P_e are edge-disjoint. On the other hand, paths P'_1 and P'_e might either be edge-disjoint, as in Fig. 13a, or they share an edge, as shown in Figs. 13b and 13c. Note that in the second case the edge of P'_1 incident to v_1 is the same as the corresponding edge of P'_e .

Consider triplet T_{f_1} of the lemma that contains face f_1 of T . Since by assumption $T_{f_1} \neq T_2$, triplet T_{f_1} must contain at least one of the triangular faces that share edge (v_1, w_1) or (v_1, u) with face f_1 . Assume w.l.o.g. that T_{f_1} contains the face sharing edge (v_1, w_1) with f_1 ; the case where T_{f_1} contains the face sharing edge (v_1, u) with f_1 is symmetric. Let u' be the third vertex of this face that is different from vertices v_1 and w_1 ; see Fig. 13. Since both u and u' are vertices of triplet T_{f_1} , edge (u, u') is an edge of G . Furthermore u' lies in the interior of the cycle (w_2, P'_1, v_1, w_1) . In particular, the presence of path P'_1 in G_p implies that edge (u, u') is a clearly crossing edge of G .




Fig. 13: Illustration for the proof of Lemma 4.8.

Since \mathcal{T} is not bad there exists a \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R} of G that extends $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}}$. We focus on edge (u, u') in \mathcal{R} , and consider two cases, depending on whether paths P'_1 and P'_e are edge-disjoint or not. If P'_1 and P'_e are edge-disjoint, the edge (u, u') in \mathcal{R} must cross an edge of P'_1 , an edge of P_e and an edge of P'_e , as shown in Fig. 13a. This implies that \mathcal{R} cannot exist, since (u, u') has at least three crossings; a contradiction to the assumption that \mathcal{T} is not bad. If P'_1 and P'_e share edge (v_1, v') , then in \mathcal{R} , edge (u, u') must cross the edge of P_e that is incident to v_1 , say (v_1, w') , and the common edge (v_1, v') of paths P'_1 and P'_e (otherwise, we can conclude as before that \mathcal{T} is bad). Furthermore, vertex u' belongs to path P_1 as otherwise (u, u') also crosses an edge of P_1 creating three crossings along (u, u') . This implies that in \mathcal{R} , $\langle v_1, u', v', w', u \rangle$ is a facial 5-clique, and edge (u', w') is a crossing edge of this facial 5-clique; see Figs. 13b and 13c.

Now, triplet T_{f_1} contains vertices u, v_1, w_1 and u' . Let z be the last vertex of T_{f_1} which by the assumptions of the lemma is not a vertex of T , and it is adjacent to vertices u, w_1 and v_1 .

Since by the assumption of the lemma, T_{f_1} is face-disjoint from T_1 and T_e , it follows that z is in the interior of the region bounded by cycle (w_2, P'_1, v_1, w_1) or the region bounded by cycle (v_1, P'_e, v_2, u) . In the first case; see Fig. 13b, edge (u, z) can't be drawn since it should cross paths P'_1, P'_e and P_e , having at least three crossings; a contradiction. Similarly, in the second case; see Fig. 13c, edge (w_1, z) can't be drawn since it should cross paths P_1, P'_1 and P'_e , having at least three crossings; a contradiction. The lemma follows. \square

Lemma 4.9 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$. Assume that T_1 is face-disjoint from T , that T_2 shares faces f and f_2 with T , and $T_e = T_1$. If T_2 has exactly two common vertices with T_1 , then \mathcal{T} is bad.*

Proof. From the assumptions stated in the lemma, edges e and e_1 belong to both triplets T and T_1 . This implies that T and T_1 share vertices v_1, w_2 and v_2 . If T




Fig. 14: Illustration for the proof of Lemma 4.9.

and T_1 share another vertex, then T_2 and T_1 would have at least three common vertices, contradicting the assumptions of the lemma.

Hence, T and T_1 form the configuration shown in Fig. 14a which is unique up to a renaming of vertices w_1 and u and a renaming of vertices w_1' and u' . Triplet T_2 contains vertices w_1, w_2, u, v_2 and a vertex z which by the assumptions of the lemma does not belong to T or T_1 .

Assume that \mathcal{T} is not bad, i.e., there exists a \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R} of G that extends $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}}$ such that T is a facial 5-clique in \mathcal{R} . Assume w.l.o.g. that z lies in the exterior of the cycle $Z = (v_1, u, v_2, u')$ of G_p as shown in Fig. 14b. Since T_2 is a triplet, edges (z, w_1) and (z, w_2) belong to G . Furthermore, (z, w_1) and (z, w_2) are clearly crossing edges, as w_1 and w_2 lie in the interior of Z and z in its exterior; see Fig. 14b.

In \mathcal{R} , edge (z, w_1) must cross both edges (v_1, u') and (v_1, w_1') . This implies that $C = \langle z, v_1, w_1, w_1', u \rangle$ is a facial 5-clique in \mathcal{R} ; see Fig. 14b. Similarly, edge (z, w_2) must cross edges (v_2, u') and (v_2, w_1') (the latter crossing is unavoidable in the presence of the facial 5-cliques formed by T and C), hence $C' = \langle z, u', w_1', w_2, v_2 \rangle$ is another facial 5-clique of \mathcal{R} . Then C and C' form two facial 5-cliques in \mathcal{R} and share vertices z, u' and w_1' , contradicting Property 2.3. \square

Lemma 4.10 (*). *Let G be optimal 2-planar and let $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$. \mathcal{T} is not bad if and only if every set $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$ is bad.*

Proof. Since G is optimal 2-planar, then at least one of \mathcal{T} or $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$ for some triplets T_1 and T_2 is not bad. Hence if \mathcal{T} is bad, the lemma holds. It remains to argue that if \mathcal{T} is not bad, then every set $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$ is bad. Assume that this is not the case, and there exist triplets T_1 and T_2 such that $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$ is not bad.

By Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, exactly one of T_1 and T_2 is face-disjoint with T . Assume, w.l.o.g. that T_1 is face-disjoint with T , i.e. Case C.1 applies for T_1 . Then either T_2 shares only face f_1 with T or it shares only faces f and f_2 with T , i.e. either Case C.2 or Case C.3 applies for T_2 , respectively. Thus, $T_1 \neq T_2$ also holds.

In the first case, by Lemma 4.3 it follows that vertex u of T has degree 9 and that there exists a vertex $x \in S = N(u) \setminus V(T)$ such that $|N(x) \cap S| \leq 1$. On

the other hand, applying Lemma 4.4 for vertex $u \in V(T)$, we conclude that \mathcal{T} is bad, contradicting our assumption that both \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' are not bad. Hence, we can assume that T_2 shares only faces f and f_2 with T , i.e. Case C.3 applies for T_2 . Consider edge e of T . Since \mathcal{T}' is not bad, $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$ can be extended to at least one \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G . Let \mathcal{R}' be such a rotation scheme and let triplet T_e be the triplet that edge e is assigned to w.r.t. \mathcal{R}' . We observe first that $T_e \neq T_2$. Indeed, since T_2 shares vertices u , w_1 , w_2 and v_2 with T , $T_e = T_2$ would imply that $T_2 = T$; a contradiction. We distinguish two cases, depending on whether $T_e \neq T_1$ or $T_e = T_1$.

Case 1: $T_e \neq T_1$. Since $T_e \neq T_1$ and $T_e \neq T_2$ it follows that e belongs neither to T_1 nor to T_2 . Furthermore, the existence of \mathcal{R}' implies that $\mathcal{T}'' = \mathcal{T}' \cup \{T_e\}$ is not bad. Applying Lemma 4.6 for \mathcal{T} , we conclude that for every vertex $v \in V(T)$ with degree nine, there exists a vertex $x \in S = N(v) \setminus V(T)$ such that $|N(x) \cap S| \geq 4$. In particular, this property holds for vertices w_1 and u if any of them has degree nine. Since \mathcal{T}'' is not bad, we conclude from Lemma 4.5 that T_1 does not contain w_1 while T_e does not contain u . Hence, by Lemma 4.7 for \mathcal{T}'' , there exists a triplet T_{f_1} that contains face f_1 of T , shares only vertices of f_1 with T , and is face-disjoint from all triplets of \mathcal{T}'' . Then, Lemma 4.8 implies that \mathcal{T} is bad; a contradiction.

Case 2: $T_e = T_1$. Both triplets T and T_1 contain edges e_1 and e , hence they contain their endpoints, i.e. T and T_1 share at least three vertices. Since \mathcal{T}' is not bad, and since triplets T_1 and T_2 both contain vertices v_2 and w_2 , triplets T_1 and T_2 have exactly two common vertices by Property 2.3. Now the conditions of Lemma 4.9 are fulfilled and we conclude that \mathcal{T} is bad; a contradiction. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 4.11 (*). *Let G be optimal 2-planar and let $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$. \mathcal{T} is bad if and only if the conditions of at least one of Lemmas 4.4, 4.6, 4.8 and 4.9 are met.*

Proof. Clearly, if we can apply at least one of these lemmas for \mathcal{T} then \mathcal{T} is bad. So, assume that \mathcal{T} is bad, and that for each of these lemmas not all conditions hold for \mathcal{T} . Since G is optimal 2-planar, by Lemma 4.10, there exists a set $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2\}$ that is not bad.

By Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, exactly one of T_1 and T_2 is face-disjoint with T . Assume, w.l.o.g. that T_1 is face-disjoint with T . Then either T_2 shares only face f_1 with T or it shares only faces f and f_2 with T .

In the first case, since \mathcal{T} does not fulfill all conditions of Lemma 4.4, we conclude that, in particular for vertex $u \in V(T)$, $d(u) > 9$ holds or every vertex $x \in S = N(u) \setminus V(T)$ has $|N(x) \cap S| \geq 2$. Then, the conditions of Lemma 4.3 are satisfied, and \mathcal{T}' is bad; a contradiction.

Hence, we can assume that T_2 shares only faces f and f_2 with T . Consider edge e of T . Since \mathcal{T}' is not bad, $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{T}'}$ can be extended to at least one \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G . Let \mathcal{R}' be such an embedding and let triplet T_e be the triplet that e is assigned to w.r.t. \mathcal{R}' .

Since \mathcal{T} does not satisfy all conditions of Lemma 4.9, either $T_e \neq T_1$ or T_2 does not have exactly two common vertices with T_1 . If T_2 has at least three

common vertices with T_1 , then by Property 2.3, set \mathcal{T}' is bad. On the other hand, if T_2 has exactly one common vertex with T_1 , then $T_e \neq T_1$, as otherwise, T_2 and T_1 would share vertices w_2 and v_2 . Hence, it suffices to consider the case where $T_e \neq T_1$. Note that $T_e \neq T_2$ also holds. Indeed, since T_2 shares vertices u, w_1, w_2 and v_2 with T , $T_e = T_2$ would imply that $T_2 = T$ also holds; a contradiction.

Then $\mathcal{T}'' = \{T_1, T_2, T_e\}$ is not bad, which implies that T_e is face-disjoint from T_1 and T_2 . Since \mathcal{T} does not satisfy all conditions of Lemma 4.6, in particular for vertex $w_1 \in V(T)$, $d(w_1) > 9$ holds or there exists a vertex $x \in S = N(w_1) \setminus V(T)$ such that $|N(x) \cap S| \geq 4$. If T_1 contains vertex w_1 , then Lemma 4.5 implies that \mathcal{T}'' is bad; a contradiction. Hence, T_1 does not contain vertex w_1 . Using the same argument for vertex $u \in V(T)$, we conclude that T_e does not contain vertex u . Already all conditions of Lemma 4.8 are satisfied except for the constraints related to T_{f_1} . Since by assumption not all conditions of Lemma 4.8 are met, we conclude that every triplet T_{f_1} that contains f_1 (i) shares at least four vertices with T , or, (ii) is not face-disjoint with at least one triplet of \mathcal{T}'' . Then all conditions of Lemma 4.5 are satisfied and \mathcal{T}'' is bad. The lemma follows. \square

D Omitted Proofs and Details from Section 5

Theorem 2. *Algorithm 1 is correct.*

Proof. We assume that the input graph G has exactly $5|V| - 10$ edges and is 9-degenerate. We proceed with the four steps of our algorithm as described in Section 5.1 and formalized in Algorithm 1. In the first step, we use Corollary 2.3 to classify each edge of G as clearly crossing or potentially planar. Recall that an edge is potentially planar if and only if its two endpoints have at least six common neighbors.

From Lemma 3.1 we get that if two potentially planar edges of G cross each other in some optimal 2-planar rotation scheme, then they belong to an instance of CROSS-BAT. Hence, in the second step, we identify all such instances and by Lemma 3.2 we can fix the partial rotation scheme of the subgraph induced by the vertices of each CROSS-BAT instance. By doing this, we change the classification of two potentially planar edges of each instance to clearly crossing edges. Note that by Lemma 3.4 for every CROSS-BAT instance, there exist exactly two pairs of potentially planar edges that cross, hence the reclassification process takes place only when potentially planar edges cross in some optimal 2-planar rotation scheme.

As a result, the subgraph G_p defined by the set of potentially planar edges is planar. Furthermore, if G is optimal 2-planar, then G_p must also be 3-connected and spanning G , as it contains as subgraph the 3-connected pentangulation of every \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G . Hence if G_p is not planar or if G_p is not 3-connected we can conclude that G is not optimal-2-planar. If G_p is planar and 3-connected, we compute its unique planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R}_p . Note that by Lemma 3.3, if G is optimal 2-planar, then there exists a \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R} of G . As mentioned at the

beginning of Section 4, all faces of \mathcal{R}_p must have length 3, 4 or 5. In particular non-triangular faces belong to facial 5-cliques of \mathcal{R} and hence they induce complete subgraphs in G . If these properties are violated, we conclude that \mathcal{R} does not exist and G is not optimal 2-planar. In order to proceed with the next step, we first need to augment G_p to maximal planar. To achieve this, we arbitrarily triangulate every non-triangular face of \mathcal{R}_p (this process can not create parallel edges or self-loops in G_p as it is 3-connected). Also, since non-triangular faces induce complete subgraphs in G , the added edges belong to G and are classified as clearly crossing. We change their classification to potentially planar so that they belong to G_p .

The next step is to calculate the triplets of \mathcal{R}_p , which can be accomplished by computing the paths of length two of the dual G_p^* of G_p and check whether the vertices of the three faces induce a 5-clique in G .

Now, for each triplet T we can use Lemma 4.11 to decide whether $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$ is bad or not. If \mathcal{T} is not bad, we mark triplet T as a facial 5-clique. By definition, if T is a facial 5-clique of any \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G , then the three clearly crossing edges of T are assigned to T and to no other triplet by Lemma 4.10. Hence if any clearly crossing edge of G is not assigned to exactly one triplet, then we can conclude that G is not optimal-2-planar. Similarly, a face of \mathcal{R}_p is assigned to exactly one triplet. If this property does not hold, then G is not optimal 2-planar.

Having reached this point, G is an optimal 2-planar graph and it remains to compute its \mathcal{R}_p -compliant optimal 2-planar rotation scheme by combining the embedding \mathcal{R}_p of G_p and the triplets marked as facial 5-cliques. To do this, for each triplet $T = \langle f_1, f, f_2 \rangle$ as depicted in Fig. 3, for every vertex v of T we insert the clearly crossing edges of T that are incident to v between the corresponding edges of G_p in the cyclic order of edges around v . Also, we define the order of crossings along each edge of T as indicated by Fig. 3.

The correctness of Algorithm 1 follows from the above analysis. \square

Details 1. In our algorithm, we assume that the given graph has $5n - 10$ edges and is 9-degenerate. Checking whether a graph has these properties can be done in linear time by using standard algorithms [25].

For checking whether G_p is planar and 3-connected, and for computing the planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R}_p of G_p (the cyclic order of the edges around each vertex, and the faces corresponding to the embedding), as well as the dual graph G_p^* we use standard algorithms that run in linear time and data structures that consume linear space [22,23].

In all steps, it is required to check whether two vertices are adjacent or to find the edge between two given vertices. Since G is 9-degenerate, for each vertex v_i in the degeneracy sequence v_1, \dots, v_n , we separately store its edges in subgraphs $G_i = G[v_1, \dots, v_i]$ and $G'_i = G[v_i, \dots, v_n]$. For $j > i$, edge (v_i, v_j) belongs to G_j . Hence, it suffices to only check the stored edges of v_j in G_j , which are at most nine. Hence, the cost of these operations is $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

Lemma 5.1 (*). *All edges of G can be classified as potentially planar or clearly crossing in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time.*

Proof. First, we compute a 9-degenerate sequence $L = v_1, \dots, v_n$ of the vertices of G in linear time [25]. In order to classify the edges, for each edge (u, v) we count the number of common neighbors of u and v as follows. For $i = n, \dots, 1$ we process vertex v_i . Recall that since G is 9-degenerate, vertex v_i has at most nine neighbors in G_i . For each of the at most $\binom{9}{2} = 36$ pairs of neighbors u, w of v_i in G_i , we check whether they are connected by an edge in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time. If so, we update the number of common neighbors for the edges (u, v_i) , (v_i, w) and (u, w) . After this process, we check whether the number of common neighbors computed for each edge (u, v) is at least 6 or not. If this is the case we mark (u, v) as potentially planar, otherwise as clearly crossing. Since for every vertex, we process at most 36 pairs of neighbors in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time each, the classification of all edges of G takes $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time in total. \square

Lemma 5.2 (*). *All CROSS-BAT instances of G can be identified in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time if all edges are already classified as clearly crossing or potentially planar.*

Proof. We iterate over all edges of G trying to identify first the base edge of each CROSS-BAT instance. Recall that each base edge is potentially planar and both its endpoints have degree 9. So, in our iteration we explicitly focus on such edges. Let (u, u') be such an edge. If (u, u') is the base edge of a CROSS-BAT instance, then $|N(u, u')| = 8$. Since u and u' are degree-9 vertices, we can check in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time if $N(u, u')$ has eight elements. If this is not true, then (u, u') is not the base edge of a CROSS-BAT instance. Otherwise, let H be the subgraph induced by $N(u, u') \cup \{u, u'\}$ and let $N(u, u') = \{u_1, \dots, u_8\}$. In the following, we try to find an isomorphism between u_1, \dots, u_8 and the vertices of CROSS-BAT as named in Fig. 2a.

Clearly, if H is an instance of CROSS-BAT, then $\{u_1, \dots, u_8\}$ must have the same degree-sequence in decreasing order as CROSS-BAT. If this is not true, then H is not an instance of CROSS-BAT.

Since vertices v and w of CROSS-BAT are the only vertices with 4 or 5 neighbors in CROSS-BAT (depending on whether they are adjacent to v' and w' , respectively), we can find the corresponding two vertices of H ; assume w.l.o.g. that $\{u_1, u_2\} = \{v, w\}$. From the set of the remaining vertices $S = \{x, x', y, y', v', w'\}$ of CROSS-BAT, only v' and w' have five neighbors in S . W.l.o.g., let $u_3 = v'$ and $u_4 = w'$.

Now x and x' are connected to v' with potentially planar edges, while y and y' are connected to v' with clearly crossing edges. This allows to distinguish x and x' from y and y' . So, let w.l.o.g. $\{u_5, u_6\} = \{x, x'\}$ and $\{u_7, u_8\} = \{y, y'\}$. Also, x and x' are connected to v and not connected to w . Hence, we can identify v and w ; w.l.o.g. let $u_1 = v$ and $u_2 = w$.

It remains to identify x, x', y and y' . Since the pairs $\{x, y\}$ and $\{x', y'\}$ are symmetric in CROSS-BAT, we arbitrarily choose $x = u_5$. Since x is connected to y but not to y' , this allows to identify y ; w.l.o.g. let $y = u_7$. Then we can conclude that $x' = u_6$ and $y' = u_8$. After the mapping of the vertices of H to the ones of CROSS-BAT, it remains to check that H is isomorphic to CROSS-BAT, i.e., that it contains exactly the edges of CROSS-BAT, and that the edges of H have the

same classification (clearly crossing or potentially planar) as the corresponding edges of the CROSS-BAT.

If the above process fails at any step, then we can conclude that H is not an instance of CROSS-BAT. After identifying the two adjacent vertices u and u' with degree 9, all steps related to determining whether (u, u') is a base edge of a CROSS-BAT instance can be performed in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time. \square

Details 2. If G is optimal 2-planar, G_p is 3-connected, planar and spans G . These properties can be checked in linear time with algorithms that also compute the planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R}_p of G_p . Note that we ensured that G_p is 3-connected, hence, \mathcal{R}_p is uniquely defined (see line 6 of Algorithm 1). After computing \mathcal{R}_p , we can iterate over all $\mathcal{O}(n)$ faces of \mathcal{R}_p and check for each face in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time, if its length is at most five and, if so, check in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time, if it induces a complete subgraph in G (see lines 7–8). If any face violates these constraints, we reject the instance in line 9.

Next, we triangulate all faces of length four or five in line 10 of Algorithm 1. In fact, adding edges in G_p corresponds to reclassifying some clearly crossing edges of G as potentially planar. This process takes time $\mathcal{O}(n)$. Now that G_p is maximal planar, we recompute its planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R}_p and its dual G_p^* in linear time.

Details 3. Recall that a triplet $T = \langle f_1, f, f_2 \rangle$ consists of three faces f_1, f and f_2 of \mathcal{R}_p which form the path (f_1, f, f_2) of length 2 in the dual G_p^* . All vertices of G_p^* have degree 3, hence identifying all paths of length two takes linear time in the order of G_p^* , i.e. $\mathcal{O}(|V(G_p^*)|) = \mathcal{O}(n)$ time. For each path we check in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time, if the vertices of the three faces induce a 5-clique in G . If this is the case, the path is a triplet of \mathcal{R}_p . During this process, for each face and each clearly crossing edge of G , we store the set of triplets that contain it and count their cardinalities. Note that this information can be stored in linear space, since each triplet contains three faces and three clearly crossing edges of G .

Lemma 5.3 (*). *Let $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2$ and \mathcal{S}_e be the set of triplets containing e_1, e_2 and e , respectively. It can be decided in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time if \mathcal{T} is bad or not.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.11 it suffices to check whether the conditions of one of Lemmas 4.4, 4.6, 4.8 and 4.9 are met. For the first two lemmas, namely Lemmas 4.4 and 4.6, for every vertex $v \in V(T)$ with $d(v) = 9$, and every neighbor $x \notin V(T)$ of v , we compute the set $S = N(v, x) \setminus V(T)$ and its cardinality. Since $|N(v)| = 9$ and $S \subseteq N(v)$, this computation requires to check a constant number of times for the existence of some edge. Hence, it takes $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time to check whether the conditions of Lemmas 4.4 and 4.6 hold for \mathcal{T} .

The next two lemmas, namely Lemmas 4.8 and 4.9, assume that T_1 is face-disjoint from T and T_2 contains faces f and f_2 of T . The case where T_2 is face-disjoint from T and T_1 contains faces f and f_1 of T can be handled analogously. In a brute-force approach for Lemma 4.8, one would have to consider all triplets T_{f_1} that contain face f_1 and all possible sets $\mathcal{T}' = \{T_1, T_2, T_e\}$, where edges e_1, e_2 and e belong to T_1, T_2 and T_e respectively. Since T_{f_1} contains face f_1 of T , there




Fig. 15: Illustration for the proof of Proposition 5.3.1.

exist at most five ways to extend f_1 to a path of three faces in the dual G_p^* of G_p . Checking whether these paths of faces form triplets of \mathcal{R}_p and whether they share only the vertices of f_1 with T can be performed in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time. Similarly, since T_2 shares faces f and f_2 with T , there are at most three choices for its third face (face f_1 is excluded). For each choice we can identify in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time if this is a triplet of \mathcal{R}_p . Clearly if we cannot identify T_{f_1} or T_2 then the conditions of Lemma 4.8 are not met.

Now, in this brute-force approach, for triplets T_1 and T_e , there might exist a linear number of triplets that contain edge e_1 (or e), thus we would have to consider a quadratic number of sets \mathcal{T}' . Ideally we would like to have a bounded number of triplets that contain edge e_1 or e . In fact we can prove that if this is not the case, then we can always find triplets T_1 and T_e that satisfy the conditions of Lemma 4.8, i.e. it applies for \mathcal{T} . In order to achieve this, we need the following:

Proposition 5.3.1. *Let T be a triplet and consider a set \mathcal{S} of triplets with at least 20 elements. Then, at least one triplet of the set is face-disjoint with T .*

Proof. We want to count the triplets that contain at least one face of T . Each triplet corresponds to a unique path of length 2 in the dual G_p^* ; see Fig. 15. There exist five triplets that contain face f_1 but not face f , and four triplets that contain both f_1 and f . Similarly there exist nine triplets that contain face f_2 (four of them also include face f), and two triplets that contain f but not f_1 and f_2 . In total we count 20 triplets, having counted T twice: once for face f_1 and once for face f_2 . Hence there exist at most 19 different triplets that contain at least one face of T . Then if the set \mathcal{S} contains at least 20 elements, there is at least one triplet that is face-disjoint with T . \square

Along the same lines we can argue the following:

Proposition 5.3.2. *Let T be a triplet, with vertices u and v that are consecutive along its boundary in \mathcal{R}_p . Let \mathcal{S} be a set of at least six triplets that are face-disjoint from T and contain vertex u . Then, at least one triplet of the set does not contain vertex v .*

Proof. Let f and f' be the two faces of \mathcal{R}_p that share edge (u, v) . Assume w.l.o.g. that f belongs to T . Note that any triplet that is face-disjoint with T and contains

both vertices u and v , must contain face f' (and not f). There exist at most five such triplets. Hence, if \mathcal{S} has at least six elements, then it has at least one triplet that does not contain f' , i.e. does not contain vertex v as claimed. \square

Consider the set \mathcal{S}_1 of triplets that contain edge e_1 and the set \mathcal{S}_e of triplets that contain edge e . Assume w.l.o.g. that $|\mathcal{S}_1| \leq |\mathcal{S}_e|$. If $|\mathcal{S}_e| < 82$ then we can check for every $T_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1$ and every $T_e \in \mathcal{S}_e$ whether the conditions of Lemma 4.8 hold. Checking whether T_1 and T_e are face-disjoint and whether they contain vertex w_1 and u , respectively, takes $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time.

So assume that $|\mathcal{S}_e| \geq 82$. If we can find a triplet T_1 that is face-disjoint from all of T , T_2 and T_{f_1} , and does not contain vertex w_1 , then we claim that Lemma 4.8 applies and \mathcal{T} is bad. Indeed, assuming a valid T_1 , since $|\mathcal{S}_e| \geq 82$ then Proposition 5.3.1 assures that at least 63 triplets of \mathcal{S}_e are face-disjoint from T . Among these triplets, at least 44 of them are also face-disjoint from T_2 , at least 25 of these 44 are also face-disjoint from T_1 , and at least six of them are additionally face-disjoint from T_{f_1} . Then by Proposition 5.3.2 we can find a triplet T_e that, in addition to the previous properties, does not contain vertex u . Then all conditions of Lemma 4.8 are met for T_e , which implies that \mathcal{T} is bad as claimed. Hence we only need to identify triplet T_1 . If $|\mathcal{S}_1| < 63$, then we check all elements of \mathcal{S}_1 , whether they are face-disjoint from all of T , T_2 and T_{f_1} , and do not contain vertex w_1 in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time. If we find triplet T_1 , then \mathcal{T} is bad, otherwise the conditions of Lemma 4.8 are not met. If on the other hand, $|\mathcal{S}_1| \geq 63$, Propositions 5.3.1 and 5.3.2 assure that there exists a triplet T_1 with the aforementioned properties, hence the conditions of Lemma 4.8 are satisfied.

Finally, for Lemma 4.9, first we need to find triplets $T_1 = T_e$ and T_2 , if they exist. Note that if T_1 exists, then it contains the face opposite of f_2 along edge (v_2, w_2) . This face, considered as a vertex in the dual G_p^* of G_p , can be extended to at most five different paths of length 2 of G_p^* . We can check for each path in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time if its vertices create a 5-clique, i.e. if this is a triplet of \mathcal{R}_p . On the other hand, since T_2 contains faces f and f_2 of T , there are at most three choices for its third face (face f_1 is excluded). Again, we check if these options define triplets of \mathcal{R}_p in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time. Now, for every triplet T_1 and T_2 we check in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time if they are face-disjoint and whether they have exactly two common vertices. Since there exist at most five triplets T_1 and at most three triplets T_2 , checking whether Lemma 4.9 applies for \mathcal{T} can be done in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time. \square

Details 4. Here we augment the planar rotation scheme \mathcal{R}_p of G_p to an optimal 2-planar rotation scheme of G by inserting the clearly crossing edges of G appropriately. Let triplet $T = \langle f_1, f, f_2 \rangle \in \mathcal{T}^*$ as depicted in Fig. 3. For every vertex v of T we insert the clearly crossing edges of T that are incident to v between the corresponding edges of \mathcal{R}_p in the cyclic order of edges around v . This can be done in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time for the clearly crossing edges incident to a specific vertex v in a triplet as the triplet consists of the faces that provide access to the correct position in the cyclic neighbor list of v . Since the triplet also defines the crossings contained in the facial 5-clique, we can define and store the order of crossings along each edge of T in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time.