

Testing the Planar Straight-line Realizability of 2-Trees with Prescribed Edge Lengths^{*}

Carlos Alegría, Manuel Borrazzo, Giordano Da Lozzo,
Giuseppe Di Battista, Fabrizio Frati, and Maurizio Patrignani

Roma Tre University, Rome, Italy
name.lastname@uniroma3.it

Abstract. We study a classic problem introduced thirty years ago by Eades and Wormald. Let $G = (V, E, \lambda)$ be a weighted planar graph, where $\lambda : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a *length function*. The FIXED EDGE-LENGTH PLANAR REALIZATION problem (FEPR for short) asks whether there exists a *planar straight-line realization* of G , i.e., a planar straight-line drawing of G where the Euclidean length of each edge $e \in E$ is $\lambda(e)$.

Cabello, Demaine, and Rote showed that the FEPR problem is NP-hard, even when λ assigns the same value to all the edges and the graph is triconnected. Since the existence of large triconnected minors is crucial to the known NP-hardness proofs, in this paper we investigate the computational complexity of the FEPR problem for weighted 2-trees, which are K_4 -minor free. We show the NP-hardness of the problem, even when λ assigns to the edges only up to four distinct lengths. Conversely, we show that the FEPR problem is linear-time solvable when λ assigns to the edges up to two distinct lengths, or when the input has a prescribed embedding. Furthermore, we consider the FEPR problem for weighted maximal outerplanar graphs and prove it to be linear-time solvable if their dual tree is a path, and cubic-time solvable if their dual tree is a caterpillar. Finally, we prove that the FEPR problem for weighted 2-trees is slice-wise polynomial in the length of the longest path.

Keywords: Graph realizations · weighted 2-trees · straight-line drawings · planarity

1 Introduction

The problem of producing drawings of graphs with geometric constraints is a core subject in Graph Drawing (see, e.g., [3,4,5,12,16,25,26,29,36,42,46,48]). In this context, a classic question is the one of testing whether a graph can be drawn planarly so that its edges are straight-line segments of prescribed lengths. The study of such a question has connections with several topics in computational geometry [19,44,51], rigidity theory [18,32,34], structural analysis of molecules [9,33], and sensor networks [15,40,43]. Formally, given a weighted planar graph $G = (V, E, \lambda)$, i.e., a planar graph with vertex set V and edge set E equipped with a *length function* $\lambda : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, the FIXED EDGE-LENGTH PLANAR REALIZATION problem (FEPR, for short) asks whether there exists a *planar straight-line realization* of G , i.e., a planar straight-line drawing of G in the plane where the Euclidean length of each edge $e \in E$ is $\lambda(e)$. The FEPR problem was first studied by Eades and Wormald [28], who showed its NP-hardness even for triconnected planar graphs and for biconnected planar graphs with unit lengths. Cabello, Demaine, and Rote strengthened this result by proving NP-hardness even for triconnected planar graphs with unit lengths [14]. The graphs that admit a planar straight-line realization with unit lengths are also called *matchstick graphs*. Abel et al. [1] showed that recognizing matchstick graphs is strongly $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete, solving an open problem stated by Schaefer [45].

Since the existence of large triconnected minors is essential in the known hardness proofs of the FEPR problem, we study its computational complexity for weighted 2-trees, which are the maximal graphs with

^{*} This research was partially supported by MIUR Project “AHeAD” under PRIN 20174LF3T8, by H2020-MSCA-RISE project 734922 – “CONNECT”, and by Roma Tre University Azione 4 Project “GeoView”. A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the 29th International Symposium on Graph Drawing and Network Visualization (GD2021).




Fig. 1: A planar and a non-planar straight-line realization of the same weighted 2-tree.

no K_4 -minor. A *2-tree* is a graph composed of 3-cycles glued together along edges in a tree-like fashion. As an example, Fig. 1 shows a planar and a non-planar straight-line realization of the same weighted 2-tree. The class of 2-trees has been deeply studied in Graph Drawing (e.g., in [20,27,30,35,41]); such a graph class coincides with the one of the maximal series-parallel graphs. In particular, the edge lengths of planar straight-line drawings of 2-trees have been studied in [10,11].

First, we show that, in the fixed embedding setting, the FEPR problem can be solved in linear time (Section 3). We remark that the FEPR problem is NP-hard for general weighted planar graphs with fixed embedding [14,28]. Second, we show that, in the variable embedding setting, the FEPR problem is NP-hard when the number of distinct lengths is at least four (Section 4), whereas it is linear-time solvable when the number of distinct lengths is 1 or 2 (Section 5). Note that, for general weighted planar graphs, the problem is NP-hard even when all the edges are required to have the same length [28]. Third, we move our attention to maximal outerplanar graphs (Section 6), which form a notable subclass of 2-trees. We show that the FEPR problem can be solved in linear time for maximal outerpaths, i.e., the maximal outerplanar graphs whose dual tree is a path, and in cubic time for maximal outerpillars, i.e., the maximal outerplanar graphs whose dual tree is a caterpillar. Finally, we present a slice-wise polynomial algorithm for weighted 2-trees, parameterized by the length of the longest path (Section 7). Section 2 contains preliminaries and Section 8 provides conclusions and open problems.

Similarly to [14], in our algorithms, we adopt the real RAM model of computation, which is customary in computational geometry and allows us to perform standard arithmetic operations in constant time. Furthermore, we show NP-hardness in the Turing machine model by exploiting lengths whose encoding has constant size.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout the paper, we assume that graphs are connected and simple (i.e., with no loops or parallel edges). Moreover, whenever we refer to the length of a segment or to the distance of two geometric objects, we always assume that these are measured according to the Euclidean metric.

Drawings and embeddings. A *drawing* Γ of a graph is a mapping of each vertex v to a distinct point $\Gamma(v)$ in the plane and of each edge (u, v) to a Jordan arc $\Gamma(u, v)$ with endpoints $\Gamma(u)$ and $\Gamma(v)$. We often use the same notation for a vertex v and the point $\Gamma(v)$. A drawing is *planar* if it contains no two crossing edges and it is *straight-line* if each curve representing an edge is a straight-line segment. A planar drawing partitions the plane into connected regions, called *faces*. The bounded faces are the *internal faces*, while the

unbounded face is the *outer face*. The *boundary* of a face is the circular list of vertices and edges encountered when traversing the geometric border of the face. A graph G is *planar* if it admits a planar drawing. A planar drawing of G defines a clockwise order of the edges incident to each vertex of G ; the set of such orders for all the vertices is a *rotation system* for G . Two planar drawings of G are *equivalent* if (i) they define the same rotation system for G and (ii) their outer faces have the same boundaries. An equivalence class of planar drawings is a *plane embedding* (or simply an *embedding*). When referring to a planar drawing Γ of a graph that has a prescribed embedding \mathcal{E} , we always imply that Γ is in the equivalence class \mathcal{E} ; when we want to stress this fact, we say that Γ *respects* \mathcal{E} . All the planar drawings respecting the same embedding have the same set of face boundaries. Hence, we can talk about the face boundaries of a graph with a prescribed embedding. With a little overload of terminology, we sometimes write *face* of a graph with a prescribed embedding, while referring to the boundary of the face. A graph is *biconnected* if the removal of any vertex leaves the graph connected. In any planar drawing of a biconnected graph every face is bounded by a simple cycle. Let Γ be a drawing of a graph G and let G' be a subgraph of G ; the *restriction* of Γ to G' is the drawing of G' obtained by removing from Γ the vertices and edges of G that are not in G' .

2-trees and maximal outerplanar graphs. A *2-tree* is recursively defined as follows. A cycle formed by k edges is a *k -cycle*. A 3-cycle is a 2-tree. Given a 2-tree G containing the edge (u, w) , the graph obtained by adding to G a vertex v and two edges (v, u) and (v, w) is a 2-tree. We observe that any 2-tree G satisfies the following properties:

- (P1) G is biconnected;
- (P2) the two neighbors of any degree-2 vertex of G are adjacent; and
- (P3) if $|V(G)| \geq 4$, then G contains two non-adjacent degree-2 vertices.

A 2-tree G is essentially composed of 3-cycles glued together along edges in a tree-like fashion. We encode this tree-like structure in a tree we call the *decomposition tree* of G . This tree has a node for each 3-cycle of G , and an edge between two nodes if the corresponding 3-cycles have a common edge; see Fig. 2. Let T be the decomposition tree of G , and n be the number of nodes of G . We observe that T is unique and contains $n - 2$ nodes. Typically, T is *rooted at* a 3-cycle c of G . We can compute T rooted at c by a recursive construction in which, together with T , we produce an auxiliary labeling of the edges of G . An edge e is labeled with the highest node in T whose corresponding 3-cycle contains e . The construction is as follows. If G coincides with c , then T is a unique root node representing c , and each edge of c is labeled with c itself. Otherwise, by Property (P3), there is at least one degree-two vertex not belonging to c . Let v be any such a vertex, let u and w be the vertices adjacent to v , and let c^* be the 3-cycle with vertices u, v , and w . Let T^* denote the decomposition tree of $G - v$ rooted at c . We obtain T by adding to T^* a leaf representing c^* , whose parent is the node corresponding to the label of the edge (u, w) . Further, we set to c^* the labels of the edges (v, u) and (v, w) . It is not hard to see that this procedure constructs T in $O(n)$ time.

An *outerplanar drawing* is a planar drawing in which all the vertices are incident to the outer face. A graph is *outerplanar* if it admits an outerplanar drawing. An *outerplane embedding* is an equivalence class of outerplanar drawings of a graph; note that a biconnected outerplanar graph has a unique outerplane embedding [39,47]. An outerplanar graph is *maximal* if no edge can be added to it without losing outerplanarity. In the unique outerplane embedding of a maximal outerplanar graph, every internal face is delimited by a 3-cycle. The *dual tree* T of a biconnected outerplanar graph G is defined as follows. Consider the (unique) outerplane embedding \mathcal{O} of G . Then T has a node for each internal face of \mathcal{O} and has an edge between two nodes if the corresponding faces of \mathcal{O} are incident to the same edge of G . An *outerpath* is a biconnected outerplanar graph whose dual tree is a path. A *caterpillar* is a tree that becomes a path if its leaves are removed. Such path is called the *spine* of the caterpillar. An *outerpillar* is a biconnected outerplanar graph whose dual tree is a caterpillar.

Straight-line realizations. A *weighted graph* $G = (V, E, \lambda)$ is a graph equipped with a length function λ that assigns a positive real number to each edge. A *straight-line realization* of G is a straight-line drawing of G in which each edge e is drawn as a line segment of length $\lambda(e)$. If the drawing is planar, we say that the




Fig. 2: On the left, a 2-tree G . On the right, the decomposition tree of G rooted at Δ_1 . Internal nodes are drawn with thick lines and leaf nodes of are drawn with thin lines.

realization is planar. The FIXED EDGE-LENGTH PLANAR REALIZATION (FEPR) problem receives as input a weighted planar graph G , and asks if there exists a planar straight-line realization of G .

In a straight-line realization of G , each 3-cycle is realized as a triangle. Hence, if the lengths of the edges of at least one 3-cycle do not respect the triangle inequality, then G does not admit any (even non-planar) straight-line realization. We can trivially test in $O(n)$ time whether the length function of an n -vertex weighted 2-tree is such that every 3-cycle satisfies the triangle inequality. Hereafter we assume that every weighted 2-tree satisfies this necessary condition.

In our proofs and algorithms, when clear from the context, we refer interchangeably to the 3-cycles of a 2-tree G , the nodes of its decomposition tree, and the triangles in a straight-line realization of G .

Triangles in a planar straight-line realization. Let $G = (V, E, \lambda)$ be a weighted 2-tree and Γ be a planar straight-line realization of G . We denote with Δ_i a triangle *drawn* in Γ , that is, the straight-line realization of a 3-cycle of G . Consider two triangles Δ_i and Δ_j . We say that Δ_i is *drawn inside* Δ_j if all the points of Δ_i are points of Δ_j and at least one vertex of Δ_i is an interior point of Δ_j . In the planar straight-line realization shown in Fig. 2, the triangles Δ_6 , Δ_7 , and Δ_8 are drawn inside the triangle Δ_3 . Observe that, if Δ_i is drawn inside Δ_j , then Δ_i and Δ_j have at most two common vertices. On the other hand, in general, Δ_i can be drawn inside Δ_j regardless of their distance in the decomposition tree of G . We have the following observation, which we use implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) in the paper.

Observation 1. *Let l_i and l_j be the lengths of the longest sides of two triangles Δ_i and Δ_j , respectively. If $l_i > l_j$, then Δ_i is not drawn in Δ_j . If $l_i = l_j$ and Δ_i is drawn inside Δ_j , then Δ_i and Δ_j share a side of length $l_i = l_j$.*

Of special interest for us is the case in which Δ_i and Δ_j share an edge. If such case occurs, then Δ_i and Δ_j are either adjacent or siblings in the decomposition tree of G . We have the following.

Observation 2. *Let Δ_i and Δ_j be two triangles sharing an edge with end-vertices a and b . Let α_i and β_i (α_j and β_j) denote the interior angles of Δ_i (resp., Δ_j) at a and b , respectively. If Δ_i is drawn inside Δ_j , then $\alpha_i < \alpha_j$ and $\beta_i < \beta_j$.*




Fig. 3: Illustration for Lemma 1. The angles in gray are smaller than 60° and the angles in white are greater than 60° . (a) A tall isosceles triangle (Δ_2 , Δ_3 , Δ_4 , and Δ_4) is not drawn inside a flat isosceles triangle (Δ_1), (b) A tall isosceles triangle (Δ_2 and Δ_3) is not drawn inside an equilateral triangle (Δ_1), and (c) An equilateral triangle (Δ_2 and Δ_3) is not drawn inside a flat isosceles triangle (Δ_1).

We derive further useful properties by considering specific types of triangles. Consider an isosceles triangle with base of length b and two sides of length l . We say the triangle is *tall isosceles* if $l > b$, and *flat isosceles* if instead $l < b$.

Lemma 1. *Let Δ_i and Δ_j be two triangles sharing an edge.*

- a) *If Δ_i is tall isosceles and Δ_j is flat isosceles, then Δ_i is not drawn inside Δ_j .*
- b) *If Δ_i is tall isosceles and Δ_j is equilateral, then Δ_i is not drawn inside Δ_j .*
- c) *If Δ_i is equilateral and Δ_j is flat isosceles, then Δ_i is not drawn inside Δ_j .*

Proof. All the statements follow from Observation 2 and the facts that (i) a tall isosceles triangle has one interior angle smaller than 60° and two interior angles greater than 60° , and (ii) a flat isosceles triangle has one interior angle greater than 60° and two interior angles smaller than 60° . Refer to Fig. 3. \square

Consider now three triangles Δ_i , Δ_j , Δ_k such that Δ_j and Δ_k share a side with Δ_i . If the three triangles have a common side, then a necessary condition for Δ_i and Δ_j to be drawn inside Δ_i is given by Observation 2. If instead there is no common side between Δ_j and Δ_k , then we have the following lemmas.

Lemma 2. *Let ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 be two lengths such that $2\ell_2 > \ell_1 > \ell_2$, and Δ_i , Δ_j , Δ_k be three triangles such that:*

- Δ_i is an equilateral triangle with sides of length ℓ_1 ,
- Δ_j and Δ_k are congruent flat isosceles triangles with base of length ℓ_1 and two sides of length ℓ_2 ,
- Δ_i shares one side with Δ_j and another side with Δ_k , and
- Δ_j and Δ_k are drawn inside Δ_i and do not overlap with each other.

Then $\frac{\ell_1}{\ell_2} > \sqrt{3} \simeq 1.73$.

Proof. Refer to Fig. 4. Let v be the common vertex between Δ_i , Δ_j , and Δ_k . Since Δ_i is equilateral the interior angle of Δ_i at v is 60° . Hence, since Δ_j and Δ_k are congruent and intersect only at v (they do not overlap), the internal angle α of both Δ_j and Δ_k at v is at most 30° . We thus have that $\ell_1 = 2\ell_2 \cos(\alpha) > 2\ell_2 \cos(30^\circ) = \sqrt{3}\ell_2$. \square




Fig. 4: Illustration for Lemma 2: If two flat isosceles triangles (Δ_j and Δ_k) are drawn inside an equilateral triangle (Δ_i), then $\frac{l_1}{l_2} > \sqrt{3}$. The black point is the circumcenter of Δ_i .

3 Prescribed Embedding

In this section, we describe an $O(n)$ -time algorithm to solve the FEPR problem for an n -vertex 2-tree whose embedding or whose rotation system is prescribed.

We start by showing how to check in linear time whether a straight-line realization of a 2-tree with prescribed embedding is a planar straight-line realization respecting the embedding. This basic tool will be exploited throughout the paper.

Theorem 3. *Let $G = (V, E, \lambda)$ be an n -vertex weighted 2-tree, \mathcal{E} be a plane embedding of G , and Γ be a straight-line realization of G . There exists an $O(n)$ -time algorithm that tests whether Γ is a planar straight-line realization respecting \mathcal{E} .*

Proof. First, we check whether Γ respects \mathcal{E} . This can be done in $O(n)$ time by checking: (i) whether the clockwise order of the edges incident to each vertex in Γ is the same as in \mathcal{E} ; and (ii) whether the cycle bounding the outer face of Γ (if Γ is planar) is the same as in \mathcal{E} . More in detail, this check is as follows.

- Check (i) only requires to scan, for each vertex v of G , the list representing the clockwise order of the edges incident to v in \mathcal{E} , and to confirm that the slopes of such edges in Γ form a decreasing sequence (where the slope of one of such edges is the one of the half-ray from v through the other end-vertex of the edge and has a value between the slope s of the first considered edge and $s - 360^\circ$). This can be done in time proportional to the degree of v and hence in $O(n)$ time over all the vertices of G .
- In order to perform check (ii), we find in $O(n)$ time the vertices v_{\leftarrow} and v_{\rightarrow} with smallest and largest x -coordinates, respectively, among the vertices of the cycle \mathcal{C} bounding the outer face of \mathcal{E} . Then we check whether the edge that leaves v_{\leftarrow} in clockwise direction along \mathcal{C} lies above the edge that enters v_{\leftarrow} in clockwise direction along \mathcal{C} in Γ . Together with check (i), this guarantees that all the edges incident to vertices of \mathcal{C} leave the vertices in \mathcal{C} towards the region inside \mathcal{C} in Γ , if Γ is planar. It might still be the case, however, that \mathcal{C} self-intersects or that other edges of G cross \mathcal{C} , hence at this point we can guarantee that \mathcal{C} bounds the outer face of Γ only by assuming its planarity.

In order to check whether Γ is planar, we augment Γ to a straight-line drawing Γ' of a maximal planar graph so that, if Γ is planar, then Γ' is planar, as well. This is done as follows. If Γ is a planar straight-line realization respecting \mathcal{E} , every internal face f of \mathcal{E} is bounded in Γ by a polygon \mathcal{P}_f whose interior is empty. We triangulate the interior of \mathcal{P}_f by the addition of dummy edges. This can be done in linear time over all the internal faces of \mathcal{E} by means of the algorithm by Chazelle [17]. We also triangulate the outer face of Γ . This is done similarly as described by Cabello et al. [14]. Namely, we enclose Γ into a large equilateral triangle T with a horizontal side ℓ . This partitions the outer face of Γ into two regions, namely a bounded region \mathcal{R} and an unbounded region \mathcal{R}' . We then add edges from v_{\leftarrow} and v_{\rightarrow} to the left and right end-vertices of ℓ , respectively. This subdivides \mathcal{R} into two regions delimited by simple polygons. We triangulate the interior of such polygons, again using Chazelle's algorithm [17]. Denote by Γ' the resulting straight-line drawing.

If Γ is a planar straight-line realization respecting \mathcal{E} , then (as described in [14]) every execution of Chazelle’s algorithm terminates correctly. Hence, if at least one of the executions of Chazelle’s algorithm terminates in error, we conclude that Γ is not a planar straight-line realization respecting \mathcal{E} . It might also be the case that every execution of Chazelle’s algorithm terminates correctly and yet Γ contained crossings. Hence, we also need to check whether Γ' is planar. This can be done in $O(n)$ time, as if Γ' is planar, it is a triangulation (i.e., a planar straight-line drawing such that every face is delimited by a triangle) and the planarity of convex subdivisions can be tested in $O(n)$ time [22]. \square

Theorem 4. *Let $G = (V, E, \lambda)$ be an n -vertex weighted 2-tree, let \mathcal{R} be a rotation system for G , and let Γ be a straight-line realization of G . There exists an $O(n)$ -time algorithm that tests whether Γ is a planar straight-line realization whose rotation system is \mathcal{R} .*

Proof. We are going to recover the cycle \mathcal{C} that bounds the outer face of Γ (if Γ is planar) by exploiting the knowledge of \mathcal{R} and of Γ itself. Then it suffices to invoke Theorem 3 in order to test whether Γ is a planar straight-line realization respecting \mathcal{E} , where \mathcal{E} is the plane embedding that has \mathcal{R} as rotation system and \mathcal{C} as cycle bounding the outer face.

In order to recover the cycle \mathcal{C} that bounds the outer face of Γ , we first find in $O(n)$ time the leftmost vertex v_0 in Γ and we then find in $O(n)$ time the edge (v_0, v_1) incident to v_0 with largest slope; note that, if Γ is planar, then v_0 and v_1 are encountered consecutively when traversing \mathcal{C} in clockwise direction. Now suppose that, for some $i \geq 1$, a path (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_i) has been found such that, if Γ is planar and has \mathcal{R} as rotation system, then the vertices v_0, v_1, \dots, v_i are encountered consecutively when traversing \mathcal{C} in clockwise direction. Then, if Γ is planar and has \mathcal{R} as rotation system, the vertex v_{i+1} that is encountered after v_i when traversing \mathcal{C} in clockwise direction is the vertex that follows (v_i, v_{i-1}) in the clockwise order of the edges incident to v_i in \mathcal{R} ; such a vertex can be found in $O(1)$ time. When this process encounters a vertex v_k for the second time, if such a vertex is not v_0 , then we conclude that Γ is not a planar straight-line realization whose rotation system is \mathcal{R} , otherwise we have found the desired cycle \mathcal{C} . \square

We note that theorems as the previous two cannot be stated for general planar graphs. Indeed, an easy reduction from ELEMENT UNIQUENESS [7] shows that even testing whether a straight-line drawing of an n -vertex graph with no edges is planar requires $\Omega(n \log n)$ time.

In order to prove the main results of this section, we need the following lemma, which might be of independent interest and which is applicable to planar graphs that are not necessarily 2-trees.

Lemma 3. *Let G be an n -vertex planar graph and let \mathcal{R} be a rotation system for G . A data structure can be set up in $O(n)$ time that allows one to answer in $O(1)$ time the following type of queries: Given three edges e_i, e_j , and e_k incident to a vertex v of G , determine whether they appear in the order e_i, e_j , and e_k or in the order e_i, e_k , and e_j in the clockwise order $\mathcal{R}(v)$ of the edges incident to v in \mathcal{R} .*

Proof. The proof’s main idea is the same as the one of Aichholzer et al. [2] for the $O(n^2)$ -time construction of a data structure that allows to answer in $O(1)$ time queries about the orientation of triples of points in the plane.

Consider any vertex v of G . Let $\mathcal{R}(v) = [e_1, \dots, e_\ell]$; note that $\mathcal{R}(v)$ is a circular list, which is here linearized by picking any edge as e_1 . Label each edge e_i with the value (v, i) . This labeling labels each edge of G twice, hence it is performed in $O(n)$ time. The data structure claimed in the statement simply consists of G equipped with these edge labels.

Now suppose that a query as in the statement has to be answered for three edges e_i, e_j , and e_k incident to a vertex v of G . We recover in $O(1)$ time the labels (v, i) , (v, j) , and (v, k) respectively associated to e_i, e_j , and e_k . Assume that i is smaller than j and k ; then e_i, e_j , and e_k appear in the order e_i, e_j , and e_k in $\mathcal{R}(v)$ if and only if $j < k$, which can be checked in $O(1)$ time. Analogously, if $j < i$ and $j < k$, we have that e_i, e_j , and e_k appear in the order e_i, e_j , and e_k in $\mathcal{R}(v)$ if and only if $k < i$, while if $k < i$ and $k < j$, we have that e_i, e_j , and e_k appear in the order e_i, e_j , and e_k in $\mathcal{R}(v)$ if and only if $i < j$. \square

We now present the main results of this section.

Theorem 5. *Let G be an n -vertex weighted 2-tree and \mathcal{R} be a rotation system for G . There exists an $O(n)$ -time algorithm that tests whether G admits a planar straight-line realization whose rotation system is \mathcal{R} and, in the positive case, constructs such a realization.*

Proof. The algorithm is as follows. First, among all the 3-cycles of G , we pick a 3-cycle c with largest sum of the edge lengths, which can clearly be done in $O(n)$ time. Second, we compute in $O(n)$ time the decomposition tree T of G rooted at c . Third, by means of Lemma 3, we set up in $O(n)$ time a data structure that allows us to decide in $O(1)$ time whether any three edges e_i , e_j , and e_k incident to a vertex v of G appear in the order e_i , e_j , and e_k or in the order e_i , e_k , and e_j in the clockwise order of the edges incident to v in \mathcal{R} .

Let γ be any straight-line realization of c and let γ' be the reflection of γ . Note that γ is unique, up to rigid transformations. Hence, if there exists a planar straight-line realization Δ of G whose rotation system is \mathcal{R} and whose restriction to c is some triangle δ , then there also exists a planar straight-line realization Γ of G whose rotation system is \mathcal{R} and whose restriction to c is either γ or γ' . Indeed, Γ can be obtained from Δ by applying the rotation and translation that turn δ into either γ or γ' ; then the rotation system for Γ is the same as the one for Δ , hence it is \mathcal{R} .

We show how to test in $O(n)$ time whether there exists a planar straight-line realization of G whose rotation system is \mathcal{R} and whose restriction to c is γ (in the positive case, such a realization is constructed within the same time bound). An analogous test can be performed with the constraint that c is represented by γ' rather than γ . Then the algorithm concludes that a planar straight-line realization of G whose rotation system is \mathcal{R} exists if and only if (at least) one of the two tests is successful.

We are going to use the following key property.

Property 1. Let (u, v, w) be a cycle of G such that u is not a vertex of c . Let P be a shortest path from u to (any vertex of) c and suppose that the edge of P incident to u , say (u, z) , is such that z is different from v and w . Then, in any planar straight-line realization of G , the edge (u, z) lies outside (u, v, w) .

Proof. Consider any planar straight-line realization Γ of G . Since z is different from v and w and since P is a shortest path, we have that P contains neither v nor w . Hence, if z lies inside (u, v, w) , then so does c , by the planarity of Γ . However, this is not possible, since c is a 3-cycle whose sum of the edge lengths is maximum, by definition. \square

Our algorithm visits T in pre-order starting at c ; let c_1, \dots, c_{n-2} be the order in which the nodes of T are visited. For $i = 1, \dots, n-2$, let G_i be the subgraph of G composed of the 3-cycles c_1, \dots, c_i ; note that $G_1 = c = c_1$ and $G_{n-2} = G$. Also, let \mathcal{R}_i be the restriction of \mathcal{R} to G_i .

Clearly, if Γ is a planar straight-line realization of G whose rotation system is \mathcal{R} and whose restriction to c is γ , then, for any $i = 1, \dots, n-2$, the restriction of Γ to G_i is a planar straight-line realization Γ_i of G_i whose rotation system is \mathcal{R}_i and whose restriction to c is γ . We prove that, if such a realization Γ_i of G_i exists, then it is unique and can be computed in $O(1)$ time from Γ_{i-1} (from γ , if $i = 1$). During the visit of T we maintain, for each vertex u of G_i that does not belong to c , the first edge (u, z) of a shortest path P_u from u to (any vertex of) c in G_i . Further, we maintain, for each vertex u of G_i , a value $\ell(u)$; this is equal to the number of edges of P_u , if u does not belong to c , and to 0, otherwise.

When visiting c_1 , we set $\Gamma_1 = \gamma$ in $O(1)$ time. Obviously, Γ_1 is the unique planar straight-line realization of G_1 in which the straight-line realization of c_1 is γ (the rotation system \mathcal{R}_1 does not impose any constraint). We initialize $\ell(u) = 0$ for each vertex u of c_1 .

Assume that, for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n-3\}$, a straight-line realization Γ_i of G_i has been constructed such that, if a planar straight-line realization whose rotation system is \mathcal{R}_i and whose restriction to c is γ exists, then Γ_i is the unique such a realization. Let $c_{i+1} = (u, v, w)$, where $e_{uv} := (u, v)$ is the edge that c_{i+1} shares with the 3-cycle represented by the parent of c_{i+1} in T , while w is the unique vertex of G_{i+1} not in G_i . Let e_{uw} and e_{vw} denote the edges (u, w) and (v, w) , respectively. Assume, w.l.o.g., that $\ell(u) \leq \ell(v)$. Then we compute in $O(1)$ time the value $\ell(w)$ as $\ell(w) = 1 + \ell(u)$ (the $\ell(\cdot)$ value of every other vertex of G_{i+1} coincides with the one in G_i). Also, again in $O(1)$ time, we set e_{uw} as the first edge of a shortest path from w to c (for every other vertex of G_{i+1} , the first edge of a shortest path to c coincides with the one in G_i).

Note that there are two placements for w that result in the edges e_{uw} and e_{vw} having the prescribed edge lengths, thus turning Γ_i into a straight-line realization of G_{i+1} . We show that Property 1 can be used in order to define a unique placement for w in Γ_i .

If $\ell(u) > 0$, let $e_{uz} := (u, z)$ be the first edge of the shortest path from u to c in G_i (recall that we maintain this information). If $\ell(u) = 0$, then u is a vertex of c ; then we define $e_{uz} := (u, z)$ as any edge of c different from e_{uv} (note that e_{uv} might or might not be an edge of c). In both cases, we use Lemma 3 to determine in $O(1)$ time whether the clockwise order of the edges e_{uv} , e_{uw} , and e_{uz} in \mathcal{R} is e_{uv} , e_{uw} , and e_{uz} or e_{uv} , e_{uz} , and e_{uw} . Suppose, without loss of generality, it is the former. We now proceed according to the following case distinction.




Fig. 5: Illustrations of Cases 1, 2, and 3 for the insertion of w and its incident edges in Γ_i . Both possible placements of w are shown (a chosen placement is shown in black).

Case 1: If neither of the two possible placements of w guarantees that the clockwise order of the edges e_{uv} , e_{uw} , and e_{uz} in Γ_{i+1} is e_{uv} , e_{uw} , and e_{uz} , as in Fig. 5a, then we conclude that there exists no planar straight-line realization of G_{i+1} whose rotation system is \mathcal{R}_{i+1} and whose restriction to c is γ .

Case 2: If exactly one of the two possible placements of w guarantees that the clockwise order of the edges e_{uv} , e_{uw} , and e_{uz} in Γ_{i+1} is e_{uv} , e_{uw} , and e_{uz} , as in Fig. 5b, then we choose that placement for w . Indeed, choosing the other placement for w would imply that, even if the resulting straight-line realization of G_{i+1} was planar, it would not have \mathcal{R}_{i+1} as its rotation system.

Case 3: If both the possible placements of w guarantee that the clockwise order of the edges e_{uv} , e_{uw} , and e_{uz} in Γ_{i+1} is e_{uv} , e_{uw} , and e_{uz} , as in Fig. 5c, then we observe that one of the two placements of w is such that (at least part of) the edge e_{uz} is internal to the triangle (u, v, w) , while the other placement is such that the edge e_{uz} is external to the triangle (u, v, w) . We choose the latter placement for w .

If $\ell(u) > 0$, this choice is motivated by Property 1. Indeed, u is not a vertex of c , given that $\ell(u) > 0$; further, z is different from w (as z belongs to G_i , while w does not) and from v (by the assumption $\ell(u) \leq \ell(v)$ and $\ell(z) = \ell(u) - 1$). Hence, Property 1 applies and in any planar straight-line realization of G_{i+1} , the edge e_{uz} is external to (u, v, w) .

If $\ell(u) = 0$, then e_{uz} is an edge of c , hence if e_{uz} were internal to (u, v, w) , then c would be internal to (u, v, w) , as well (the two cycles share the vertex u and, possibly, the vertex v and the edge (u, v)). However, this is not possible in any planar straight-line realization of G_{i+1} , as the sum of the edge lengths of c is greater than or equal to the sum of the edge lengths of (u, v, w) , by the definition of c .

The clockwise order of the edges e_{uv} , e_{uw} , and e_{uz} according to a placement for w can be computed in $O(1)$ time, as well as whether the edge e_{uz} is external to the triangle (u, v, w) or not. Hence, Γ_{i+1} can be constructed in $O(1)$ time from Γ_i .

When $i = n - 2$, we have that, if there exists a planar straight-line realization of $G = G_{n-2}$ whose rotation system is $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_{n-2}$ and whose restriction to c is γ , then the constructed representation $\Gamma := \Gamma_{n-2}$ is the unique such a realization. Hence, it only remains to test whether Γ is a planar straight-line realization of G whose rotation system is \mathcal{R} . This can be done in $O(n)$ time by means of Theorem 4. \square

We can similarly deal with the case in which the cycle bounding the outer face of the planar straight-line realization is prescribed, as in the following theorem.

Theorem 6. *Let G be an n -vertex weighted 2-tree and \mathcal{E} be a plane embedding of G . There exists an $O(n)$ -time algorithm that tests whether G admits a planar straight-line realization that respects \mathcal{E} and, in the positive case, constructs such a realization.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{R} be the rotation system associated with \mathcal{E} . By exploiting \mathcal{R} and ignoring the knowledge of the cycle delimiting the outer face of \mathcal{E} , at most two straight-line realizations of G can be constructed in $O(n)$ time, exactly as in the proof of Theorem 5, such that G admits a planar straight-line realization whose rotation system is \mathcal{R} if and only if one of these two realizations is planar and has \mathcal{R} as its rotation system. Differently from the proof of Theorem 5, we use Theorem 3 rather than Theorem 4 to test in $O(n)$ time whether any of the two realizations is planar and respects \mathcal{E} . \square

4 NP-hardness for 2-trees with four edge lengths

In this section, we present a polynomial-time reduction from the PLANAR MONOTONE 3-SAT problem to the FEPR problem with *four* edge lengths. As the former is known to be NP-complete [8], the reduction shows NP-hardness of the latter. We thus have the following.

Theorem 7. *The FIXED EDGE-LENGTH PLANAR REALIZATION problem is NP-hard for weighted 2-trees, even for instances whose number of distinct edge lengths is 4.*

Let ϕ be a Boolean formula in conjunctive normal form with at most three literals on each clause. We denote by G_ϕ the *incidence graph* of ϕ , that is, the graph that has a vertex for each clause of ϕ , a vertex for each variable of ϕ , and an edge (c_i, v_j) for each clause c_i that contains the literal v_j or the literal \bar{v}_j . The formula ϕ is an instance of PLANAR MONOTONE 3-SAT if G_ϕ is planar and each clause of ϕ is either *positive* or *negative*. A positive clause contains only *positive literals* (i.e., literals v_j for some variable v_j), while a negative clause only contains *negated literals* (i.e., literals \bar{v}_j for some variable v_j).

Let ϕ be an instance of PLANAR MONOTONE 3-SAT. Hereafter we assume that each clause of ϕ contains *exactly* three literals. This is not a loss of generality, since a clause with less than three literals can be modified by duplicating one of the literals in the clause, which does not alter the satisfiability of ϕ . Note this modification might turn G_ϕ into a planar multi-graph. Nevertheless, since this is not relevant for our reduction, it will be ignored hereforth.

A *monotone rectilinear representation* of G_ϕ is a drawing that satisfies the following properties (refer to Fig. 6a):




Fig. 6: Monotone rectilinear representations of G_ϕ . Boxes representing variables are red, whereas boxes and trapezoids representing clauses are blue. (a) The original monotone rectilinear representation Γ_ϕ . (b) The modified monotone rectilinear representation Γ_ϕ^* that satisfies properties D1–D7.

- P1:** Variables and clauses are represented by axis-aligned boxes with the same height.
- P2:** The bottom sides of all boxes representing variables lie on the same horizontal line.
- P3:** The boxes representing positive (resp. negative) clauses lie above (resp. below) the boxes representing variables.
- P4:** The edges connecting variables and clauses are vertical segments.
- P5:** The drawing is crossing-free.

The PLANAR MONOTONE 3-SAT problem has been shown to be NP-complete, even when the incidence graph is provided along with a monotone rectilinear representation [8]. Given an instance ϕ of the PLANAR MONOTONE 3-SAT problem and a rectilinear representation Γ_ϕ of ϕ , we construct a weighted 2-tree H_ϕ that admits a planar straight-line realization *if and only if* ϕ is satisfiable. The general strategy of the reduction is as follows. In Section 4.1 we describe how to modify Γ_ϕ into an auxiliary representation Γ_ϕ^* that satisfies a set of convenient properties (see Fig. 6b). We then exploit the geometric information of Γ_ϕ^* to construct H_ϕ , so that the edges of H_ϕ are assigned four distinct lengths. Namely, in Section 4.3, we describe gadgets for the variables, for the clauses, and for the edges of G_ϕ . Finally, in Section 4.4, we show how to combine these gadgets to form H_ϕ .

4.1 The auxiliary monotone rectilinear representation

We start by describing how to transform Γ_ϕ into a new representation Γ_ϕ^* that satisfies the following properties (refer to Fig. 6b):

- D1:** The corners of the polygons and the end-points of the segments forming Γ_ϕ^* lie on the points of the grid formed by equidistant lines with slope 0° , 60° , and 120° , in which each grid cell is an equilateral triangle with sides of unit length.
- D2:** The height and width of the bounding box of Γ_ϕ^* are polynomially bounded in the size of ϕ .
- D3:** The variables are represented by axis-aligned boxes. Let δ_ϕ denote the maximum degree of G_ϕ . The boxes have width $2\delta_\phi - 1$, height $2\sqrt{3}(\delta_\phi - 1)$, and have their bottom sides on a common horizontal grid line.
- D4:** The clauses are represented by trapezoids. Each trapezoid has height $2\sqrt{3}$, lateral sides with slope 60° , and horizontal sides whose length is larger than 8.
- D5:** The edges connecting variables and clauses are line segments with slope 60° .
- D6:** Consider the box \mathcal{B} representing a variable. The edges incident to \mathcal{B} have horizontal distance from the left side of \mathcal{B} that is a multiple of 2.
- D7:** Consider the trapezoid \mathcal{T} representing a positive (resp. negative) clause c . Let p_1 , p_2 , and p_3 be the intersection points between the segments representing the edges of G_ϕ incident to c and the bottom (resp. top) horizontal side of \mathcal{T} . The point p_1 lies on the bottom-left (resp. top-left) corner of \mathcal{T} , the horizontal distance between p_1 and p_2 is at least three, the horizontal distance between p_2 and p_3 is at least four, and the horizontal distance between p_3 and the bottom-right (resp. top-right) corner of \mathcal{T} is equal to one.

The transformation is described in the following lemma.

Lemma 4. *The drawing Γ_ϕ^* can be constructed in polynomial time starting from Γ_ϕ .*

Proof. We first transform Γ_ϕ into an intermediate rectilinear representation Γ'_ϕ that satisfies properties D1–D3, property D6, and two properties that we denote by **D4'** and **D7'**, obtained from properties D4 and D7, respectively, by substituting trapezoids with boxes. Since every segment of a geometric object forming Γ_ϕ is either horizontal or vertical, we can transform Γ_ϕ into Γ'_ϕ by suitable scaling the boxes representing variables and clauses, and by a suitable deformation of the plane.

We transform Γ'_ϕ into Γ_ϕ^* as follows. Observe that, since Γ'_ϕ satisfies property D3, the top (resp. bottom) sides of the boxes representing variables lie on a horizontal line ℓ_t (resp. ℓ_b). The transformation consists of two horizontal shear mappings that transform vertical segments into segments with slope 60° and are

applied, respectively, to the points of the plane above ℓ_t and below ℓ_b . More precisely, these shear mappings are as follows. Translate the Cartesian reference system so that the x -axis coincides with ℓ_t (and the origin is anywhere). The first shear mapping then maps every point (x, y) with $y \geq 0$ to the point $(x + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}y, y)$. Again translate the Cartesian reference system so that the x -axis coincides with ℓ_b (and the origin is anywhere). The second shear mapping then maps every point (x, y) with $y \leq 0$ to the point $(x - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}y, y)$.

We show next that the resulting representation Γ_ϕ^* satisfies properties D1–D7:

- D1: This property is satisfied since Γ'_ϕ satisfies property D1. Note that the distance between two consecutive grid lines (with slope either 0° , or 60° , or 120°) is $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$.
- D2: Let \mathcal{B}' and \mathcal{B}^* denote, respectively, the bounding boxes of Γ'_ϕ and Γ_ϕ^* . Property D2 is satisfied since Γ'_ϕ satisfies property D2, the height of \mathcal{B}^* is equal to the height of \mathcal{B}' , and the width of \mathcal{B}^* is at most the width of \mathcal{B}' plus $\sqrt{3}$ times the height of \mathcal{B}' .
- D3 and D6: These properties are satisfied since Γ'_ϕ satisfies properties D3 and D6, and the shear mappings do not move the points contained in the horizontal strip bounded by ℓ_t and ℓ_b .
- D4, D5, and D7: These properties are satisfied since Γ'_ϕ satisfies properties D4' and D7', since the shear mappings transform vertical segments outside the horizontal strip delimited by ℓ_t and ℓ_b into segments with slope 60° , and since the shear mappings do not alter the distance between any two points on the same horizontal line.

We complete the proof by observing that all the transformations described above can be clearly computed in polynomial time. \square

4.2 Overview of the reduction

For the sake of clarity, before describing in detail the reduction from Γ_ϕ^* to H_ϕ , we provide next a high-level description of the gadgets we employ to obtain H_ϕ . In Section 4.3 we present complete constructions, as well as lemmas to guarantee that the gadgets behave as required for the correctness of the reduction.

We define three main types of gadgets. A variable $v_i \in \phi$ is modeled by means of a gadget we call *variable gadget*, a clause $c_j \in \phi$ by means of a gadget we call a *clause gadget*, and an edge $(v_i, c_j) \in G_\phi$ by means of a gadget we call a *k-transmission gadget*. We also define two auxiliary gadgets we call *ladder gadgets* and *flag gadgets*. Ladder gadgets are used to provide structural rigidity to the reduction, and flag gadgets are used as an auxiliary tool in the construction of clause gadgets. To construct the gadgets we use the lengths $w_1 := 1$, $w_2 := 0.9$, $w_3 := 0.2$, and $w_4 := 1.61$. In the figures, we represent edges of length w_1, w_2, w_3 , and w_4 by means of black, red, blue, and green segments, respectively. The lengths w_1 and w_2 play a special role in the reduction. We use them to define two main types of triangles: Equilateral triangles with sides of length w_1 , which we call *frame triangles*, and flat isosceles triangles with base of length w_1 and two shorter sides of length w_2 , which we call *transmission triangles*. We refer to the subgraph of a gadget formed by its frame triangles as the *frame* of the gadget. With the exception of clause gadgets, the frame of every gadget is a maximal outerplanar graph with a unique planar straight-line realization (up to rigid transformations); whereas the frame of a clause gadget consists of three maximal outerplanar graphs. The variable, clause, and k -transmission gadgets are constructed in such a way that every frame triangle shares two of its sides each with a different transmission triangle. Since $\frac{w_1}{w_2} = \frac{1}{0.9} < \sqrt{3}$, by Lemma 2 we have that, in any planar straight-line realization of H_ϕ , two transmission triangles that share a side with a frame triangle cannot both be drawn inside such a frame triangle. This property is exploited in order to propagate along the frame of the gadgets the truth values of each literal; this value is initially determined by the embedding of a transmission triangle inside one or the other of its two incident frame triangles of a variable gadget. A final common property of all our gadgets is a set of special edges we call *attachment edges*, which are edges of frame triangles that are also edges of transmission triangles. In the figures, attachment edges are represented as thick black segments. We use attachment edges to combine gadgets together so that the encoded truth values can be propagated along the resulting 2-tree. We exploit properties D1–D7 of Γ_ϕ^* to guarantee that, after combining all the gadgets, H_ϕ has a planar straight-line realization if and only if ϕ is satisfiable.




Fig. 7: Overview of the reduction showing only the frame triangles of the involved gadgets.

An example of a planar straight-line realization of H_ϕ is shown in Fig. 7. This example illustrates a high-level sketch of the reduction from Γ_ϕ^* to H_ϕ . The grid formed by lines with slope 0° , 60° , and 120° is shown in light gray. For the sake of clarity, we only show the frames of the gadgets forming H_ϕ . To illustrate the correspondence with the boxes of Fig. 6b that represent the variables and clauses of ϕ , we also show the bounding boxes of the variable gadgets (in dashed red) and the trapezoids enclosing the clause gadgets (in dashed blue). We next provide a high-level description of each gadget.

The variable gadget. Remember that δ_ϕ denotes the maximum degree of G_ϕ . The variable gadget provides $2\delta_\phi$ attachment edges. Further, its frame is a maximal outerplanar graph, hence it has a unique planar straight-line realization, up to rigid transformations. Let Γ be a planar straight-line realization of the variable gadget, $\Gamma_f \subset \Gamma$ be the realization of the frame of the gadget in Γ , and B_f be the bounding box of Γ_f . In Fig. 7, the realization Γ_f is shaded gray and B_f is shown with red dashed lines. Up to a rotation of Γ , we have that δ_ϕ attachment edges lie along the top side of B_f , say s_t , while the remaining δ_ϕ attachment edges lie along the bottom side of B_f , say s_b . The crucial property of the variable gadget is that, in Γ , either *all* the transmission triangles incident to attachment edges along s_t are drawn outside Γ_f , or *all* the transmission triangles incident to attachment edges along s_b are drawn outside Γ_f . We exploit this property to encode the truth assignment of the variable modeled by the gadget. In particular, the purpose of the attachment edges on s_t is to propagate the truth value to incident positive clauses, while the purpose of the attachment edges on s_b is to propagate the negated truth value to incident negative clauses.

The ladder gadget. By Property D3, the bottom sides of the boxes representing variables lie on the same horizontal grid line in Γ_ϕ^* . Consider the order of appearance of the boxes while traversing such line from left to right. The ladder gadget consists of a sequence of frame triangles that form a maximal outerpath and that connect the frames of two consecutive variable gadgets; see the triangles shaded blue in Fig. 7. The purpose of the ladder gadgets is to make the entire graph H_ϕ biconnected and to make the union of the frames of

all the gadgets a maximal outerplanar graph, which has a unique planar straight-line realization, up to rigid transformations. This realization can then be navigated by the truth values of the variables.

The k -transmission gadget. Let v_i and c_j be a variable and a clause of ϕ , respectively, such that (v_i, c_j) is an edge of G_ϕ . Let \mathcal{V}_i denote the variable gadget modeling v_i and \mathcal{C}_j denote the clause gadget modeling c_j . The purpose of the transmission gadget is to “transmit” to \mathcal{C}_j the truth value of v_i corresponding to the realization of \mathcal{V}_i . The frame of the k -transmission gadget is a sequence of k frame triangles that form a maximal outerpath; see the triangles shaded yellow in Fig. 7. The parameter k coincides with twice the length of the segment representing the edge (v_i, c_j) in Γ_ϕ^* . The k -transmission gadget provides two attachment edges, each incident to one of the faces of the frame that correspond to the end-vertices of its dual path. To connect \mathcal{V}_i to \mathcal{C}_j , one of these attachment edges is identified with an attachment edge of \mathcal{V}_i and the second one is identified with an attachment edge of \mathcal{C}_j .

The clause gadget. Unlike the aforementioned gadgets, the clause gadget consists of three distinct connected components. Two of these components are formed by frame and transmission triangles. The third component is not only formed by frame and transmission triangles, but also by a special subgraph we call a *flag gadget*. The frame of each component forms a maximal outerpath; see the triangles shaded light green in Fig. 7. The clause gadget contains six attachment edges. Three of them, that we call *input attachment edges*, are used to combine the clause gadget with the three k -transmission gadgets modeling the edges of G_ϕ incident to the clause. The remaining three, that we call *output attachment edges*, are used to model the logic of the clause; in particular, one of them connects the frame of a component to the flag gadget.

Consider a positive clause c_j that contains the literal v_i . The clause c_j is modeled in H_ϕ by a clause gadget \mathcal{C}_j and is represented in Γ_ϕ^* by a trapezoid t_j . The edge (v_i, c_j) of G_ϕ is modeled in H_ϕ by a k -transmission gadget $\mathcal{T}_{i,j}$ and is represented in Γ_ϕ^* by a line segment $s_{i,j}$. The gadgets \mathcal{C}_j and $\mathcal{T}_{i,j}$ are combined together by means of an attachment edge e of $\mathcal{T}_{i,j}$ that is identified with an input attachment edge of \mathcal{C}_j . The combination of \mathcal{C}_j with $\mathcal{T}_{i,j}$ exploits the following geometric property. Consider the unique planar straight-line realization of the subgraph of H_ϕ that is the union of all the ladder gadgets and of the frames of all the variable and transmission gadgets. By Property D5 of Γ_ϕ^* and the fact that k coincides with twice the length of $s_{i,j}$, we have that, in such a realization, the attachment edge e is represented by a line segment lying along the bottom side of t_j . If c_j is instead negative, then e lies along the top side of t_j .

By the geometric property described above, the input attachment edges of the components of \mathcal{C}_j are represented by line segments that lie either all on the bottom or all on the top side of t_j . The frames of the components of \mathcal{C}_j can thus be defined so that, in any planar straight-line realization of \mathcal{C}_j , we have that (i) all the frames are entirely contained in t_j and (ii) the output attachment edges are represented by line segments that are “close” to each other. In Fig. 7, we emphasize this closeness by depicting a pink-shaded hexagon whose vertices coincide with some of the endpoints of these line segments.

Consider the transmission triangles incident to the output attachment edges of the components of \mathcal{C}_j . The clause gadget admits a planar straight-line realization *if and only if* at least one of these transmission triangles is drawn inside its incident frame triangle. Let C be a component of \mathcal{C}_j . Assume again that the input attachment edge of C is shared with a k -transmission gadget $\mathcal{T}_{i,j}$ that connects \mathcal{C}_j to the variable gadget representing a variable v_i . Our gadgets guarantee that, in any planar straight-line realization of H_ϕ , the transmission triangle incident to the output attachment edge of C can be drawn inside its adjacent frame triangle only if the gadget modeling v_i represents the value **False** (resp. **True**) and c_j is positive (resp. negative). Thus, if all three variables appearing in c_j represent the value **False** (resp. **True**) and c_j is positive (resp. negative), then H_ϕ admits no planar straight-line realization. Conversely, if at least one of the variables appearing in c_j represents the value **True** (resp. **False**) and c_i is positive (resp. negative), then the transmission triangle of the corresponding component of \mathcal{C}_j can be drawn inside its incident frame triangle so that \mathcal{C}_j admits a planar straight-line realization.




Fig. 8: Illustration of two k -transmission gadgets (in (a) and in (b)), differing from one another for the choice of the attachment edge belonging to Δ_t . For each of the two k -transmission gadgets, both a planar straight-line realization in which Δ_{IN} is drawn inside Δ_s and a planar straight-line realization in which Δ_{OUT} is drawn inside Δ_t are shown. In these illustrations, we have $k = 4$.

4.3 Description of the gadgets

We now present complete constructions for the following gadgets: The *transmission gadget*, the *split gadget*, the *variable gadget*, the *flag gadget*, and the *clause gadget*. We will later show how to precisely combine these gadgets to obtain H_ϕ .

In the following, whenever we combine two gadgets G_1 and G_2 , we proceed as follows. First, we identify one attachment edge of G_1 with one attachment edge of G_2 to obtain a single edge e that belongs to both G_1 and G_2 . Second, we remove the degree-2 vertex of any of the two transmission triangles sharing the edge e , together with the two edges incident to such vertex. This operation always results in a 2-tree, as a consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma 5. *Let G_1 and G_2 be two 2-trees, and let e_1 be an edge of G_1 and e_2 be an edge of G_2 . The graph G obtained from G_1 and G_2 by identifying e_1 and e_2 is a 2-tree.*

Proof. We prove the statement by induction on $|V(G_2)|$.

In the base case, $|V(G_2)| = 3$, that is, G_2 is a 3-cycle. Then G is obtained by adding to G_1 a vertex v and two edges (v, u) and (v, w) , where u and w are the end-vertices of e_1 . Hence G is a 2-tree.

In the inductive case, let v be a degree-2 vertex of G_2 that is different from both the end-vertices of e_2 . This vertex exists by Property (P3) of a 2-tree. Let u and w be the neighbors of v in G_2 . By Property (P2) of a 2-tree, we have that (u, w) is an edge of G_2 . Let G'_2 be the graph obtained from G_2 by removing v and its incident edges (v, u) and (v, w) ; note that e_2 is an edge of G'_2 . By induction, the graph G' obtained from G_1 and G'_2 by identifying e_1 and e_2 is a 2-tree. Then G is obtained by adding to G' the vertex v and the edges (v, u) and (v, w) ; since G' contains the edge (u, w) , it follows that G is a 2-tree. \square

The k -transmission gadget. For any positive even integer k , a *k -transmission gadget* consists of a sequence $\Delta_s = \Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_k = \Delta_t$ of k frame triangles, in which each triangle shares exactly one edge with its successor; refer to Fig. 8. For each pair of consecutive frame triangles, we insert a transmission triangle (solid red triangles in Fig. 8) whose base edge we identify with the common edge between the frame triangles. When the value k is not relevant, we refer to a k -transmission gadget simply as a “transmission gadget”. A k -transmission gadget provides two attachment edges. The first attachment edge, which we denote e_{IN} , can be selected as any of the two edges of Δ_s that is not shared with its successor frame triangle. Similarly, the

second attachment edge, which we denote e_{OUT} , can be selected as any of the two edges of Δ_t that is not shared with its predecessor frame triangle. This yields four possible k -transmission gadgets. We complete the construction of a transmission gadget by inserting a transmission triangle Δ_{IN} whose base we identify with e_{IN} , and a transmission triangle Δ_{OUT} whose base we identify with e_{OUT} ; see the dashed triangles in Fig. 8.

Clearly, a transmission gadget is a 2-tree and its frame is a maximal outerpath. In any planar straight-line realization of a transmission gadget, its attachment edges are either parallel or not. In the first case, we say that the transmission gadget is *straight*, whereas in the second case we say that it is *turning*; the transmission gadgets in Fig. 8a and Fig. 8b are straight and turning, respectively. We have the following lemma.

Lemma 6. *In any planar straight-line realization of a transmission gadget, if Δ_{IN} is drawn inside Δ_s , then Δ_{OUT} is drawn outside Δ_t . Further, if Δ_{OUT} is drawn inside Δ_t , then Δ_{IN} is drawn outside Δ_s .*

Proof. Consider the sequence $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_k$ of frame triangles of a transmission gadget, where $\Delta_s = \Delta_1$ and $\Delta_t = \Delta_k$. For $i = 1, \dots, k-1$, the triangles Δ_i and Δ_{i+1} share a single edge, which is the base of a transmission triangle we denote with Δ_i^T .

We only prove the first part of the statement, since the second part is symmetric. Consider any planar straight-line realization of a transmission gadget in which Δ_{IN} is drawn inside Δ_s . Since $\frac{w_1}{w_2} = \frac{1}{0.9} < \sqrt{3}$, by Lemma 2 we have that Δ_{IN} and Δ_1^T are not both drawn inside $\Delta_1 = \Delta_s$; therefore Δ_1^T is drawn inside Δ_2 . Similarly, since Δ_i^T is drawn inside Δ_{i+1} , then Δ_{i+1}^T is drawn inside Δ_{i+2} for $i = 1, \dots, k-2$. Finally, since Δ_{k-1}^T is drawn inside $\Delta_k = \Delta_t$, we have that Δ_{OUT} is drawn outside Δ_t . \square

The split gadget. Let T^1 and T^2 be two straight 4-transmission gadgets. The split gadget can be obtained from T^1 and T^2 as follows. For $i = 1, 2$, let us denote the triangles Δ_{IN} , Δ_{OUT} , Δ_s , and Δ_t of T^i as Δ_{IN}^i , Δ_{OUT}^i , Δ_s^i , and Δ_t^i , respectively, and the attachment edges e_{IN} and e_{OUT} of T^i as e_{IN}^i and e_{OUT}^i , respectively; see Fig. 9a. For $i = 1, 2$, let Δ_i' be the transmission triangle of T^i that is incident to the frame triangle Δ_s^i and different from Δ_{IN}^i . First, we replace Δ_i' with a scalene triangle, which we still refer to as Δ_i' , whose longest side is shared with Δ_s^i and whose two shorter sides have length w_2 and w_3 ; refer to Fig. 9b. After this replacement, we still denote the “modified” transmission gadgets as T^1 and T^2 . Finally, we identify the frame triangles Δ_s^1 and Δ_s^2 to obtain a single frame triangle we denote with Δ_s , and we identify the transmission triangles Δ_{IN}^1 and Δ_{IN}^2 to obtain a single transmission triangle we denote with Δ_{IN} ; refer to Figs. 9c and 9d. By Lemma 5 and the fact that the transmission gadgets are 2-trees, we have that the split gadget is a 2-tree and its frame is a maximal outerpath.

The split gadget provides three attachment edges. Namely, the attachment edge e_{IN} incident to Δ_{IN} (obtained by identifying e_{IN}^1 and e_{IN}^2), the attachment edge e_{OUT}^1 incident to Δ_{OUT}^1 , and the attachment edge e_{OUT}^2 incident to Δ_{OUT}^2 . We have the following property.

Property 2. The scalene triangles Δ_1' and Δ_2' satisfy the following properties.

- (a) The triangles Δ_1' and Δ_2' can be drawn together inside Δ_s without intersecting each other.
- (b) Neither Δ_1' nor Δ_2' can be drawn together with Δ_{IN} inside Δ_s without intersecting each other.

Proof. Statement (a) follows from the fact that the angles of Δ_1' and Δ_2' incident to the vertex they share sum up to less than 60° . Indeed, by the law of the cosines, such angles are equal to $\arccos\left(\frac{w_1^2 + w_2^2 - w_3^2}{2w_1w_2}\right) < \arccos(0.983) < 11^\circ$.

Statement (b) follows from the fact that, for $i = 1, 2$, the angles of Δ_i' and Δ_{IN} incident to the vertex they share sum up to more than 60° . Indeed, by the law of the cosines, such angles are equal to $\arccos\left(\frac{w_1^2 + w_3^2 - w_2^2}{2w_1w_3}\right) > \arccos(0.57) > 54^\circ$ and $\arccos\left(\frac{w_1}{2w_2}\right) > \arccos(0.56) > 55^\circ$, respectively. \square

Using Property 2, the proof of Lemma 6 can be easily adapted to obtain the following.

Lemma 7. *In any planar straight-line realization of the split gadget, if Δ_{IN} is drawn inside Δ_s , then Δ_{OUT}^1 is drawn outside Δ_t^1 and Δ_{OUT}^2 is drawn outside Δ_t^2 . Further, if Δ_{OUT}^1 is drawn inside Δ_t^1 or Δ_{OUT}^2 is drawn inside Δ_t^2 , then Δ_{IN} is drawn outside Δ_s .*




Fig. 9: Split gadget construction. (a) The 4-transmission gadgets T^1 and T^2 . (b) The gadgets T^1 and T^2 after replacing Δ'_1 and Δ'_2 with scalene triangles. (c) The split gadget with Δ_{IN} drawn inside Δ_s . (d) The split gadget with Δ_{OUT}^i drawn inside Δ_t^i , for $i = 1, 2$.

The variable gadget. Remember that δ_ϕ denotes the maximum degree of G_ϕ . Let $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{2\delta_\phi-2}$ be $2\delta_\phi-2$ split gadgets, and $T_2, T_3, \dots, T_{2\delta_\phi-3}$ be $2\delta_\phi-4$ straight transmission gadgets such that, for $i = 2, \dots, \delta_\phi-1$, the gadgets T_i and $T_{2\delta_\phi-i-1}$ are $4(i-1)$ -transmission gadgets. The variable gadget can be obtained by combining these gadgets as follows; refer to Fig. 10.

- For $i = 1, \dots, \delta_\phi-2$, we combine S_i and S_{i+1} by identifying the attachment edge e_{IN} of S_i with the attachment edge e_{OUT}^1 of S_{i+1} ;
- we combine $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$ and S_{δ_ϕ} by identifying the attachment edge e_{IN} of $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$ with the attachment edge e_{IN} of S_{δ_ϕ} ;
- for $i = \delta_\phi, \dots, 2\delta_\phi-3$, we combine S_i and S_{i+1} by identifying the attachment edge e_{OUT}^1 of S_i with the attachment edge e_{IN} of S_{i+1} ; and
- for $i = 2, \dots, 2\delta_\phi-3$, we combine S_i and T_i by identifying the attachment edge e_{OUT}^2 of S_i with the attachment edge e_{IN} of T_i .

By Lemma 5 and the fact that transmission and split gadgets are 2-trees, we have that the variable gadget is a 2-tree and its frame is a maximal outerplanar graph.

The variable gadget provides $2\delta_\phi$ attachment edges; refer to Fig. 11. Namely:

- the attachment edges e_{OUT}^1 and e_{OUT}^2 of S_1 ,
- for $i = 2, \dots, 2\delta_\phi-3$, the attachment edge e_{OUT} of T_i , which we denote as e_{OUT}^{i+1} , and




Fig. 10: Schema of the variable gadget when the maximum degree δ_ϕ of G_ϕ is 4.

– the attachment edges e_{OUT}^1 and e_{OUT}^2 of $S_{2\delta_\phi-2}$, which we denote as $e_{\text{OUT}}^{2\delta_\phi-1}$ and $e_{\text{OUT}}^{2\delta_\phi}$, respectively.

For $i = 1, \dots, 2\delta_\phi$, we also denote by Δ_{OUT}^i and by Δ_t^i the transmission triangle and the frame triangle incident to e_{OUT}^i , respectively. Finally, let Δ_{IN} be the transmission triangle that is incident to the attachment edge shared by the split gadgets $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$ and S_{δ_ϕ} . We call Δ_{IN} the *truth-assignment triangle*. Intuitively, the truth value associated with a planar straight-line realization of the variable gadget, will depend on whether Δ_{IN} lies inside the frame triangle Δ_s of $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$ or inside the frame triangle Δ_s of S_{δ_ϕ} in such a realization. We show the following simple and yet useful geometric property of the variable gadget.

Property 3. In any planar straight-line realization of the variable gadget, up to a rotation, the frame lies in an axis-aligned box B of width $w_1(2\delta_\phi - 1)$ and height $2\sqrt{3}w_1(\delta_\phi - 1)$. Furthermore, the attachment edges $e_{\text{OUT}}^1, \dots, e_{\text{OUT}}^{\delta_\phi}$ lie along the top side of B at distance w_1 from each other, and the attachment edges $e_{\text{OUT}}^{\delta_\phi+1}, \dots, e_{\text{OUT}}^{2\delta_\phi}$ lie along the bottom side of B at distance w_1 from each other.

We have the following lemma. Refer to Fig. 11.

Lemma 8. *In any planar straight-line realization of the variable gadget, if the truth-assignment triangle Δ_{IN} is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_s of $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$ (resp. of S_{δ_ϕ}), then, for $i = 1, \dots, \delta_\phi$ (resp. for $i = \delta_\phi + 1, \dots, 2\delta_\phi$), the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^i is drawn outside the frame triangle Δ_t^i . Furthermore, if there is some $i \in \{1, \dots, \delta_\phi\}$ (resp. some $i \in \{\delta_\phi + 1, \dots, 2\delta_\phi\}$) for which the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^i is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_t^i , then Δ_{IN} is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_s of S_{δ_ϕ} (resp. of $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$).*

Proof. We start with the first part of the statement. Let Γ be a planar straight-line realization of the variable gadget. Suppose the truth-assignment triangle Δ_{IN} is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_s of $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$ in Γ . We




Fig. 11: The variable gadget when the maximum degree δ_ϕ of G_ϕ is 4. In the logic of the reduction, the realization on the left corresponds to an assignment of **True** to the variable represented by the variable gadget, while the realization on the right corresponds to an assignment of **False** to the variable represented by the variable gadget.

show that, for $i = 1, \dots, \delta_\phi$, the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^i is drawn outside the frame triangle Δ_t^i in Γ . By a symmetric argument we can prove that, if Δ_{IN} is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_s of S_{δ_ϕ} in Γ , then, for $i = \delta_\phi, \dots, 2\delta_\phi$, the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^i is drawn outside the frame triangle Δ_t^i in Γ . We have the following claims.

Claim 1. Consider any two split gadgets S_i and S_{i-1} , for $i = \delta_\phi - 1, \dots, 2$. If the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^1 of S_i is drawn outside the frame triangle Δ_t^1 of S_i , then the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^1 of S_{i-1} is drawn outside the frame triangle Δ_t^1 of S_{i-1} .

Proof. Observe that, if the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^1 of S_i is drawn outside the frame triangle Δ_t^1 of S_i , then it lies inside the frame triangle Δ_s of S_{i-1} . Since the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^1 is in fact a copy of the transmission triangle Δ_{IN} of S_{i-1} (which has been removed when combining S_i and S_{i-1}), by Lemma 7 we have that the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^1 of S_{i-1} is drawn outside the frame triangle Δ_t^1 of S_{i-1} . \square

Claim 2. Consider any split gadget S_i and any transmission gadget T_i , for $i = \delta_\phi - 1, \dots, 2$. If the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^2 of S_i is drawn outside the frame triangle Δ_t^2 of S_i , then the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT} of T_i is drawn outside the frame triangle Δ_t of T_i .




Fig. 12: The triangles (a, b, c) , (d, b, c) , (g, d, c) , and (g, h, c) of the flag gadget.

Proof. Observe that, if the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^2 of S_i is drawn outside the frame triangle Δ_t^2 of S_i , then it lies inside the frame triangle Δ_s of T_i . Since Δ_{OUT}^2 is in fact a copy of the transmission triangle Δ_{IN} of T_i (which has been removed when combining S_i and T_i), by Lemma 6 we have that the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT} of T_i is drawn outside the frame triangle Δ_t of T_i . \square

Since the truth-assignment triangle Δ_{IN} lies inside the frame triangle Δ_s of $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$, then by Lemma 7, the transmission triangles Δ_{OUT}^1 and Δ_{OUT}^2 of $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$ are drawn outside the frame triangles Δ_t^1 and Δ_t^2 of $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$, respectively. Hence, in the variable gadget, the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^i is drawn outside the frame triangle Δ_t^i ; this follows from Claim 1 for $i = 1, 2$, and from Claim 2 for $i = 3, \dots, \delta_\phi$.

We now prove the second part of the statement. Let Γ be a planar straight-line realization of the variable gadget. Suppose that, for some $j \in \{1, \dots, \delta_\phi\}$, there is a transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^j of the variable gadget drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_t^j of the variable gadget. We show that the truth-assignment triangle Δ_{IN} is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_s of S_{δ_ϕ} in Γ . By a symmetric argument we can prove that, if there is some $j \in \{\delta_\phi + 1, \dots, 2\delta_\phi\}$ for which a transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^j of the variable gadget is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_t^j of the variable gadget, then the truth-assignment triangle Δ_{IN} is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_s of $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$ in Γ . We have the following two claims, whose proofs are symmetric to the proofs of Claims 1 and 2.

Claim 3. *Consider any two split gadgets S_i and S_{i-1} , for $i = \delta_\phi - 1, \dots, 2$. If the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^1 of S_{i-1} is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_t^1 of S_{i-1} , then the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^1 of S_i is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_t^1 of S_i .*

Claim 4. *Consider any split gadget S_i and any transmission gadget T_i , for $i = \delta_\phi - 1, \dots, 2$. If the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT} of T_i is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_t of T_i , then the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^2 of S_i is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_t^2 of S_i .*

If $1 \leq j \leq 2$, then the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^j of the variable gadget is actually a transmission triangle of the split gadget S_1 . Hence, by Claim 3, we have that the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^1 of $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$ is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_t^1 of $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$. If instead $3 \leq j \leq \delta_\phi$, then the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^j of the variable gadget is actually a transmission triangle of a transmission gadget. Hence, by Claim 4, we have that the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^2 of S_j is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_t^2 of S_j . This fact and again Claim 3 imply that either the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^1 of $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$ is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_t^1 of $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$ (which happens when $j < \delta_\phi$), or the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^2 of $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$ is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_t^2 of $S_{\delta_\phi-1}$ (which happens when $j = \delta_\phi$). In all cases, by Lemma 7, the truth-assignment triangle Δ_{IN} is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_s of S_{δ_ϕ} in Γ . \square




Fig. 13: The flag gadget and three planar straight-line realizations of it. In (a) and (b) the transmission triangle (a, b, c) lies inside the triangle (d, b, c) , while in (c) it lies outside (d, b, c) . In (a) the isosceles triangles (h, m, c) and (m, n, c) lie inside (h, g, c) , in (b) the isosceles triangles (h, i, g) and (i, l, g) lie inside (h, g, c) , and in (c) all four the isosceles triangles (h, m, c) , (m, n, c) , (h, m, c) , and (m, n, c) lie inside (h, g, c) .

The flag gadget. The flag gadget consists of the following triangles (see Figs. 12 and 13):

- (i) a transmission triangle (a, b, c) with base (b, c) ,
- (ii) a tall isosceles triangle (d, b, c) with base (b, c) of length w_1 and two longer sides of length w_4 ,
- (iii) a flat isosceles triangle (f, d, c) with base (d, c) of length w_4 and two shorter sides of length w_2 ,
- (iv) an equilateral triangle (g, d, c) with sides of length w_4 ,
- (v) a flat isosceles triangle (h, g, c) with base (g, c) of length w_4 and two shorter sides of length w_1 ,
- (vi) four tall isosceles triangles (h, i, g) , (i, l, g) , (h, m, c) , and (m, n, c) with bases (h, i) , (i, l) , (h, m) , and (m, n) , respectively, of length w_3 and two longer sides of length w_1 .

By Lemma 5 and the fact that any two of the listed triangles share at most one edge, we have that the flag gadget is a 2-tree. The flag gadget provides a single attachment edge, which coincides with the base (b, c) of the transmission triangle (a, b, c) .

We will exploit the following geometric properties of the flag gadget.

Property 4. The flag gadget admits, among others, planar straight-line realizations in which:

- (a) The triangle (a, b, c) lies inside the triangle (d, b, c) , and the triangles (h, m, c) and (m, n, c) lie inside the triangle (h, g, c) ; see Fig. 13a.
- (b) The triangle (a, b, c) lies inside the triangle (d, b, c) , and the triangles (h, i, g) and (i, l, g) lie inside the triangle (h, g, c) ; see Fig. 13b.
- (c) The triangle (a, b, c) lies outside the triangle (d, b, c) and the triangles (h, m, c) , (m, n, c) , (h, m, c) , and (m, n, c) lie inside the triangle (h, g, c) ; see Fig. 13c.

Property 5. The values of some relevant angles of the triangles forming the flag gadget are the following:

- $\widehat{bcd} := \arccos \frac{w_1}{2w_4} = \arccos \frac{1}{3.22} \simeq 71.91^\circ$
- $\widehat{bca} := \arccos \frac{w_1}{2w_2} = \arccos \frac{1}{1.8} \simeq 56.25^\circ$
- $\widehat{fcd} := \arccos \frac{w_4}{2w_2} = \arccos \frac{1.61}{1.8} \simeq 26.56^\circ$
- $\widehat{hcg} := \arccos \frac{w_4}{2w_1} = \arccos \frac{1.61}{2} \simeq 36.39^\circ$
- $\widehat{chg} := 180^\circ - 2 \cdot \widehat{hcg} \simeq 107.22^\circ$
- $\widehat{chm} := \arccos \frac{w_3}{2w_1} = \arccos \frac{0.2}{2} \simeq 84.26^\circ$
- Let λ be the smallest internal angle of the tall isosceles triangles with two sides of length w_1 and one side of length w_3 . We have $\lambda = 180^\circ - 2 \cdot \widehat{chm} \simeq 180^\circ - 2 \cdot 84.26^\circ = 11.48^\circ$.




Fig. 14: The (α, β) -clause gadget with $\alpha = 4$ and $\beta = 2$.

We show the following.

Lemma 9. *In any planar straight-line realization of the flag gadget, the following statements hold true:*

- (a) *If the transmission triangle (a, b, c) is drawn inside the triangle (d, b, c) , then the triangle (h, g, c) is drawn outside the triangle (g, d, c) .*
- (b) *Not both the vertices l and n lie inside the triangle (h, g, c) .*

Proof. Consider a planar straight-line realization of the flag gadget. By Properties **b** and **c** of Lemma 1, in such a realization the triangles (d, b, c) and (g, d, c) are not drawn inside one another. Hence, the triangle (f, d, c) lies inside (d, b, c) if and only if it lies outside (g, d, c) .

To prove statement (a), suppose the triangle (a, b, c) is drawn inside the triangle (d, b, c) . By our discussion above and the fact that $\widehat{fcd} + \widehat{bca} > \widehat{bcd}$, then the triangle (f, d, c) lies inside (g, d, c) . By this fact and the fact that $\widehat{fcd} + \widehat{hcg} > \widehat{dcb} = 60^\circ$, we have that the triangle (h, g, c) is drawn outside (g, d, c) . This ends the proof of statement (a).

To prove statement (b) it suffices to show that m and i cannot both lie inside the triangle (h, g, c) . This follows from the fact that $\widehat{chm} = \widehat{ghi}$ and $2 \cdot \widehat{chm} > \widehat{chg}$. \square

The clause gadget. We now describe the construction of the clause gadget. Such a construction is parametric with respect to the distances between the attachment edges of the transmission gadgets coming from the variable gadgets whose literals appear in the clause. By Property D7 and since the attachment edges of the transmission gadgets have length one, the horizontal distance between the two leftmost attachment edges is $\frac{\alpha}{2} + 2$, for some non-negative even integer value α , and the horizontal distance between the two rightmost attachment edges is $\frac{\beta}{2} + 3$, for some non-negative even integer value β . Based on the values α and β , we define the clause gadget, which we refer to as the (α, β) -clause gadget. The gadget provides three attachment edges e_{IN}^1 , e_{IN}^2 , and e_{IN}^3 incident to the transmission triangles Δ_{IN}^1 , Δ_{IN}^2 , and Δ_{IN}^3 , respectively. The attachment edges e_{IN}^1 , e_{IN}^2 , and e_{IN}^3 are identified with the attachment edges of the transmission gadgets coming from the variable gadgets whose literals appear in the clause. Also, recall that the transmission triangles Δ_{IN}^1 , Δ_{IN}^2 , and Δ_{IN}^3 are identified with the ones of the transmission gadgets coming from the variable gadgets whose literals appear in the clause. In any planar straight-line realization of H_ϕ , the edges e_{IN}^1 , e_{IN}^2 , e_{IN}^3 lie in this left-to-right order along the same horizontal line.

We now describe the (α, β) -clause gadget for a positive clause (the negative clause has a symmetric construction); refer to Fig. 14. We exploit the placement of e_{IN}^1 , e_{IN}^2 , e_{IN}^3 (which is fixed, since such edges belong to the union of the frames of the variable, ladder, and transmission gadgets) as a reference for arranging the gadget components. The (α, β) -clause gadget consists of three subgraphs C_1 , C_2 , and C_3 defined as follows.

- The subgraph C_1 is obtained by combining into a single connected component a turning 4-transmission gadget T'_1 , a straight α -transmission gadget T''_1 , a turning 2-transmission gadget T'''_1 , and a flag gadget F , as shown in Fig. 14. The attachment edge e_{IN} of T'_1 is the attachment edge e_{IN}^1 of the clause gadget.
- The subgraph C_2 is a straight 2-transmission gadget, whose attachment edge e_{IN} is the attachment edge e_{IN}^2 of the clause gadget.
- The subgraph C_3 is obtained by combining into a single connected component a turning 6-transmission gadget T'_3 , a straight β -transmission gadget T''_3 , and a straight 2-transmission gadget T'''_3 , as depicted in Fig. 14. The attachment edge e_{IN} of T'_3 is the attachment edge e_{IN}^3 of the clause gadget.

By Lemma 5 and the fact that transmission and flag gadgets are 2-trees, we have that each of C_1 , C_2 , and C_3 is a 2-tree. We say that a straight-line realization of the (α, β) -clause gadget is *feasible*, if it satisfies the following properties:

- (A) the attachment edges e_{IN}^1 , e_{IN}^2 , and e_{IN}^3 lie in this left-to-right order on a horizontal line ℓ , with horizontal distance $\frac{\alpha}{2} + 2$ between e_{IN}^1 and e_{IN}^2 , and horizontal distance $\frac{\beta}{2} + 3$ between e_{IN}^2 and e_{IN}^3 ; and
- (B) the frame triangles of the clause gadget all lie above ℓ .

Consider any feasible planar straight-line realization of the (α, β) -clause gadget. In such realization, consider the trapezoid \mathcal{T} whose base is the shortest horizontal segment containing e_{IN}^1 , e_{IN}^2 , and e_{IN}^3 , whose lateral sides have slope 60° , and whose height is $2\sqrt{3}$. Observe that the base of \mathcal{T} has length $8 + (\alpha + \beta)/2$. A key ingredient for the logic of the reduction is the following lemma.

Lemma 10. *The (α, β) -clause gadget admits a feasible planar straight-line realization if and only if at least one of the transmission triangles Δ_{IN}^1 , Δ_{IN}^2 , and Δ_{IN}^3 lies outside \mathcal{T} .*

Proof. Consider any feasible planar straight-line realization of the (α, β) -clause gadget. Note that, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, if the transmission triangle Δ_{IN}^i lies inside \mathcal{T} , then it lies inside the frame triangle Δ_s of the transmission gadget composing C_i that contains the edge e_{IN}^i . By this observation and Lemma 6, we obtain the following properties:

Property 6. Consider the transmission triangle (a, b, c) and the tall isosceles triangle (d, b, c) of the flag gadget F . If the transmission triangle Δ_{IN}^1 lies inside \mathcal{T} , then the triangle (a, b, c) is drawn inside the triangle (d, b, c) . Conversely, if the triangle (a, b, c) is drawn outside the triangle (d, b, c) , then the transmission triangle Δ_{IN}^1 lies outside \mathcal{T} .

Property 7. Consider the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT} and the frame triangle Δ_t of C_2 . If the transmission triangle Δ_{IN}^2 lies inside \mathcal{T} , then Δ_{OUT} lies outside Δ_t . Conversely, if Δ_{OUT} lies inside Δ_t , then the transmission triangle Δ_{IN}^2 lies outside \mathcal{T} .

Property 8. Consider the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT} and the frame triangle Δ_t of T'''_3 . If the transmission triangle Δ_{IN}^3 lies inside \mathcal{T} , then Δ_{OUT} is drawn outside Δ_t . Conversely, if Δ_{OUT} is drawn inside Δ_t , then the transmission triangle Δ_{IN}^3 lies outside \mathcal{T} .

Suppose first that at least one of Δ_{IN}^1 , Δ_{IN}^2 , and Δ_{IN}^3 lie outside \mathcal{T} . We prove that the (α, β) -clause gadget admits a feasible planar straight-line realization. We have the following cases:

- The transmission triangle Δ_{IN}^1 lies outside \mathcal{T} .
In this case the transmission triangles of T'_1 , T''_1 , and T'''_1 can be drawn in such a way that, in the flag gadget F , the transmission triangle (a, b, c) lies outside the triangle (b, c, d) . This allows the flag gadget to adopt the realization (c) of Property 4 (see also Fig. 13c). Observe that, regardless of whether Δ_{IN}^2 and Δ_{IN}^3 lie inside \mathcal{T} , the transmission triangles of C_2 , T'_3 , T''_3 , and T'''_3 can be drawn without crossings.
- The transmission triangle Δ_{IN}^2 lies outside \mathcal{T} .
In this case the transmission triangles of C_2 can be drawn in such a way that the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT} of C_2 lies inside the frame triangle Δ_t of C_2 . This allows the flag gadget to adopt the realization (b) of Property 4 (see also Fig. 13b). Observe that, regardless of whether Δ_{IN}^1 and Δ_{IN}^3 lie inside \mathcal{T} , the transmission triangles of T'_1 , T''_1 , T'''_1 , T'_3 , T''_3 , and T'''_3 can be drawn without crossings.




Fig. 15: Illustration for the proof of Lemma 10 when Δ_{IN}^1 , Δ_{IN}^2 , and Δ_{IN}^3 lie all in the interior of \mathcal{T} .

- The transmission Δ_{IN}^3 lies outside \mathcal{T} .

In this case the transmission triangles of T_3' , T_3'' , and T_3''' in such a way that the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT} of T_3''' lies inside the frame Δ_t of T_3''' . This allows the flag gadget to adopt the realization (a) of Property 4 (see also Fig. 13a). Observe that, regardless of whether Δ_{IN}^1 and Δ_{IN}^2 lie inside \mathcal{T} , the transmission triangles of T_1' , T_1'' , T_1''' , and C_2 can be drawn without crossings.

Suppose now that all Δ_{IN}^1 , Δ_{IN}^2 , and Δ_{IN}^3 lie inside \mathcal{T} . We prove that the (α, β) -clause gadget does not admit a feasible planar straight-line realization. We analyze the possible planar straight-line realizations of the flag gadget F . By Property 6 and statement (a) of Lemma 9, the triangle (h, g, c) is drawn outside the triangle (g, d, c) . On the other hand, by statement (b) of Lemma 9, we have that either (i) the vertex n lies outside the triangle (h, g, c) (refer to Fig. 15a), (ii) the vertex l lies outside the triangle (h, g, c) (refer to Fig. 15b), or (iii) both vertices n and l lie outside the triangle (h, g, c) . We show next that in all cases, there is an intersection between the edges two triangles of the (α, β) -clause gadget.

Consider first the case in which the vertex n lies outside the triangle (h, g, c) ; refer to Fig. 15a. The points o, p, q are the vertices of the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT} of C_2 . We prove that $\widehat{con} + \widehat{qop} > 120^\circ$ and that the length of the segment \overline{on} is smaller than w_2 . These two statements imply that the segment \overline{cn} intersects the segment \overline{oq} . To prove both statements we consider an auxiliary isosceles triangle with vertices n, c, o (note that only the side \overline{cn} of the triangle (n, c, o) corresponds to an edge of H_ϕ). We have that:

- The internal angle at c is $\widehat{nco} \simeq 48.74^\circ$. Namely, $\widehat{nco} := 240^\circ - \widehat{bcd} - \widehat{dcg} - \widehat{gch} - 2\lambda$. By Property 5, we obtain $\widehat{nco} \simeq 240^\circ - 71.91^\circ - 60^\circ - 36.39^\circ - 2 \cdot 11.48^\circ = 48.74^\circ$.
- The internal angle at o is $\widehat{con} \simeq (180^\circ - \widehat{nco})/2 = 65.63^\circ$.
- The segments \overline{co} and \overline{cn} have length w_1 .
- The segment \overline{on} has length $2w_1 \sin(\frac{\widehat{nco}}{2}) \simeq 0.83$.

Since the triangle (g, o, p) is a transmission triangle, we have that $\widehat{qop} = \arccos(\frac{w_1}{2w_2}) = \arccos(\frac{1}{1.8}) = 56.25^\circ$, and the segment \overline{oq} has length w_2 . Hence, $\widehat{con} + \widehat{qop} \simeq 65.63^\circ + 56.25^\circ = 121.88^\circ > 120^\circ$, and $|\overline{oq}| = w_2 = 0.9 > |\overline{on}| \simeq 0.83$. This implies that \overline{cn} intersects \overline{oq} , as claimed.

Consider now the case in which the vertex l lies outside the triangle (h, g, c) ; refer to Fig. 15b. The points r, t, s denote the vertices of the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT} of T_3''' . Let u be the point at distance $w_1 = 1$ from r such that the ray from r through u has slope 120° . We show that $\widehat{gru} + \widehat{lrq} + \widehat{trs} > 180^\circ$ and that the length of the segment \overline{rl} is smaller than w_2 . These two statements imply that the segment \overline{gl} intersects the segment \overline{rs} . To prove both statements we consider two auxiliary isosceles triangles. The first triangle has vertices c, g , and r . We have that:

- The segment \overline{cg} has length w_4 .
- The segment \overline{cr} has length $|\overline{cr}| = 2\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} = \sqrt{3}$.
- The internal angle at c is $\widehat{gcr} \simeq 18.09^\circ$. Namely, $\widehat{bcr} = 150^\circ$. Further, $\widehat{bcg} = \widehat{bcd} + \widehat{dcg}$ and, by Property 5, we have $\widehat{bcg} \simeq 71.91^\circ + 60^\circ = 131.91^\circ$, hence $\widehat{gcr} = \widehat{bcr} - \widehat{bcg} \simeq 18.09^\circ$.
- The segment \overline{gr} has length $|\overline{gr}| \simeq 0.54$. Namely, by the law of cosines, we have $|\overline{gr}|^2 = |\overline{cg}|^2 + |\overline{cr}|^2 - 2|\overline{cg}| \cdot |\overline{cr}| \cdot \cos(\widehat{gcr})$. Since $|\overline{cg}| = w_4 = 1.61$ and $|\overline{cr}| = \sqrt{3}$, we obtain $|\overline{gr}|^2 \simeq 2.5921 + 3 - 2 \cdot 1.61 \cdot \sqrt{3} \cdot \cos(18.09^\circ) \simeq 0.29$, hence $|\overline{gr}| \simeq 0.54$.
- The internal angle at r is $\widehat{crg} \simeq 68.25^\circ$. Namely, by the law of cosines, we have $\widehat{crg} = \arccos\left(\frac{|\overline{gr}|^2 + |\overline{cr}|^2 - |\overline{cg}|^2}{2|\overline{gr}| \cdot |\overline{cr}|}\right) \simeq \arccos\left(\frac{0.54^2 + 3 - 1.61^2}{2 \cdot 0.54 \cdot \sqrt{3}}\right) \simeq \arccos\left(\frac{0.6924}{1.8684}\right) \simeq \arccos(0.3706) \simeq 68.25^\circ$.
- The internal angle at g is $\widehat{rgc} = 180^\circ - \widehat{crg} - \widehat{gcr} \simeq 180^\circ - 68.25^\circ - 18.09^\circ = 93.66^\circ$.

The second auxiliary triangle we consider has vertices g , r , and l . We have that:

- The segment \overline{lg} has length $w_1 = 1$.
- The internal angle at g is $\widehat{rgl} \simeq 34.31^\circ$. Namely, $\widehat{lgc} = \widehat{hgc} + 2\lambda$. By Property 5, we have $\widehat{lgc} \simeq 36.39^\circ + 2 \cdot 11.48^\circ = 59.35^\circ$. We obtain that $\widehat{rgl} = \widehat{rgc} - \widehat{lgc} \simeq 93.66^\circ - 59.35^\circ = 34.31^\circ$.
- The edge \overline{lr} has length $|\overline{lr}| \simeq 0.63$. Namely, by the law of cosines, we have that $|\overline{lr}|^2 = |\overline{lg}|^2 + |\overline{rg}|^2 - 2|\overline{lg}| \cdot |\overline{rg}| \cos(\widehat{rgl})$, and hence $|\overline{lr}| \simeq \sqrt{1 + 0.54^2 - 2 \cdot 0.54 \cdot \cos(34.31^\circ)} \simeq \sqrt{0.3995} \simeq 0.63$.
- The internal angle at r is $\widehat{lr g} = 117.2^\circ$. Namely, by the law of cosines, we have $\widehat{lr g} = \arccos\left(\frac{|\overline{gr}|^2 + |\overline{lr}|^2 - |\overline{lg}|^2}{2|\overline{gr}| \cdot |\overline{lr}|}\right) \simeq \arccos\left(\frac{0.54^2 + 0.63^2 - 1^2}{2 \cdot 0.54 \cdot 0.63}\right) = \arccos\left(\frac{-0.3115}{0.6804}\right) \simeq \arccos(-0.4578) \simeq 117.2^\circ$.

Let v be the point at distance $w_1 = 1$ from r such that the ray from r through v has slope 240° . Note that $\widehat{vr u} = \widehat{vr c} + \widehat{cr g} + \widehat{gr u}$, hence $\widehat{gr u} = \widehat{vr u} - \widehat{vr c} - \widehat{cr g} \simeq 120^\circ - 30^\circ - 68.25^\circ = 21.75^\circ$. On the other hand, since the triangle (r, s, t) is a transmission triangle, we have $\widehat{trs} \simeq 56.25^\circ$ and the segment \overline{rs} has length w_2 . Hence $\widehat{gr u} + \widehat{lr g} + \widehat{trs} \simeq 21.75^\circ + 117.2^\circ + 56.25^\circ = 195.2^\circ > 180^\circ$, and $|\overline{rl}| \simeq 0.63 < w_2 = 0.9$. This implies that \overline{gl} intersects \overline{rs} , as claimed, and concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

4.4 Proof of the reduction

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section.

Proof of Theorem 7. We first prove that, starting from the boolean formula ϕ , the incidence graph G_ϕ of ϕ , and the monotone rectilinear representation Γ_ϕ of G_ϕ , we can construct the 2-tree H_ϕ in polynomial time. The first step of the construction is to obtain from Γ_ϕ the auxiliary drawing Γ_ϕ^* we described in Section 4.1. By Lemma 4, we can construct Γ_ϕ^* in polynomial time. The next step is to construct H_ϕ using Γ_ϕ^* as an auxiliary tool. We obtain H_ϕ by introducing a variable gadget, a clause gadget, and a transmission gadget for each variable, clause, and edge in G_ϕ , respectively, and then combining these gadgets together by identifying their attachment edges. In particular, we exploit Γ_ϕ^* to (i) define the size k of each k -transmission gadget that represents an edge of G_ϕ , (ii) define the parameters α and β of each (α, β) -clause gadget, and (iii) select the appropriate attachment edges to combine the gadgets together. We then merge the frames of the variable gadgets that are consecutive in the left-to-right order of the rectangles representing variables in Γ_ϕ^* . This is done by means of *ladder gadgets* (the shaded blue triangles in Fig. 7), which are maximal outerpaths, each composed of a sequence of frame triangles. We have that H_ϕ is a 2-tree by repeated applications of Lemma 5, and the union of the frame triangles induces a maximal outerplanar graph. Moreover, from the detailed description of the gadgets construction of Section 4.3, it is not hard to see that H_ϕ can be constructed in polynomial time.

We now prove that H_ϕ admits a planar straight-line realization *if and only if* ϕ is satisfiable. Suppose first that H_ϕ admits a planar straight-line realization Γ_H . We show that ϕ is satisfiable. For each variable v

of ϕ , consider the variable gadget \mathcal{V} of H_ϕ modeling v , the truth-assignment triangle Δ_{IN} of \mathcal{V} , and the frame triangle Δ_s of the split gadget S_{δ_ϕ} of \mathcal{V} ; refer to Figs. 10 and 11. We set $v = \text{True}$ if and only if Δ_{IN} is drawn inside Δ_s . We next prove this truth assignment satisfies every clause c of ϕ . Assume that c is a positive clause with variables v_1, v_2 , and v_3 , that is, $c = (v_1 \vee v_2 \vee v_3)$. The proof for the case in which c is negative is symmetric. Let \mathcal{C} denote the clause gadget modeling c and, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, let \mathcal{T}_i denote the transmission gadget modeling the edge (v_i, c) of G_ϕ . From the construction of the clause gadget, the realization of \mathcal{C} in Γ_H is such that the frame of the components of \mathcal{C} are bounded by a trapezoid \mathcal{T} . By Lemma 10, at least one of the triangles $\Delta_{\text{IN}}^1, \Delta_{\text{IN}}^2$, and Δ_{IN}^3 of \mathcal{C} lies outside \mathcal{T} . We assume w.l.o.g. that it is actually Δ_{IN}^1 the triangle that lies outside \mathcal{T} . Then Δ_{IN}^1 lies inside the frame triangle Δ_t of the transmission gadget \mathcal{T}_1 . Let \mathcal{V}_1 denote the variable gadget modeling the variable v_1 . By Lemma 6, there exists an index $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \delta_\phi\}$ such that the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^j of \mathcal{V}_1 lies inside the frame triangle Δ_t^j of \mathcal{V}_1 (for such index j the transmission triangle Δ_{OUT}^j is shared by \mathcal{V}_1 and \mathcal{T}_1). Thus, by Lemma 8, the truth-assignment triangle Δ_{IN} of \mathcal{V}_1 is drawn inside the frame triangle Δ_s of the split gadget S_{δ_ϕ} of \mathcal{V}_1 . This implies in turn that v_1 is assigned the value **True**. Since this variable appears as a positive literal in c , we have that c is satisfied. This shows that the constructed truth assignment satisfies all the clauses of ϕ .

Suppose now that ϕ is satisfiable. We show that H_ϕ admits a planar straight-line realization Γ_H . Let τ be a satisfying truth assignment for ϕ . For each variable v of ϕ , let $\tau(v)$ denote the truth value of v in τ . Observe that, up to a rigid transformation, the union of all the frame triangles of H_ϕ admits a unique planar straight-line realization. We initialize Γ_H to such a realization. Further, for each variable v , we adopt the configuration of Fig. 11a if $\tau(v) = \text{True}$ and the configuration of Fig. 11b if $\tau(v) = \text{False}$. For each transmission gadget modeling an edge of G_ϕ incident to a variable v and to a positive clause c , we adopt the configuration of Fig. 8a(right) if $\tau(v) = \text{True}$ and the configuration of Fig. 8a(left) if $\tau(v) = \text{False}$; a symmetric choice is made if c is negative. Since, for each clause c of ϕ , there exists at least one literal that is **True**, the triangle Δ_{IN}^i , $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, associated with this literal is drawn outside the trapezoid \mathcal{T} that bounds the frame of the components of \mathcal{C} in Γ_H . Then, by Lemma 10, the clause gadget modeling c admits a feasible planar straight-line realization; such realizations are used to complete the planar straight-line realization Γ_H of H_ϕ . This concludes the proof of Theorem 7.

5 A Linear-time Algorithm for 2-trees with Two Edge Lengths

In this section, we study the FEPR problem for weighted 2-trees in which each edge can only have one of at most two distinct lengths. We prove that, in this case, the FEPR problem is linear-time solvable. We first solve the case in which all the edges are prescribed to have the same length; we remark that the FEPR problem is NP-hard for general weighted planar graphs in which all the edges have the same length [28].

Theorem 8. *Let $G = (V, E, \lambda)$ be an n -vertex weighted 2-tree, where $\lambda : E \rightarrow \{w\}$ with $w \in \mathbb{R}^+$. There exists an $O(n)$ -time algorithm that tests whether G admits a planar straight-line realization and, in the positive case, constructs such a realization.*

Proof. Suppose that there exists a planar straight-line realization Γ of G . Since all the edges of G have length w , every 3-cycle of G is represented in Γ by an equilateral triangle of side w , hence no triangle can be contained inside any other triangle in Γ . This, together with the fact that G is a 2-tree, implies that Γ is an outerplanar drawing of G . Thus, if G admits a planar straight-line realization, then it is a maximal outerplanar graph and, as such, it has a unique outerplane embedding [39,47].

Therefore, in order to test whether G has a planar straight-line realization, we test whether it is an outerplanar graph; this can be done in $O(n)$ time [21,38,50]. If the test fails, we conclude that G admits no planar straight-line realization. Otherwise, we construct in $O(n)$ time its unique outerplane embedding [21,38,39,47,50]. Finally, by means of Theorem 3, we test in $O(n)$ time whether G has a planar straight-line realization that respects the computed outerplane embedding. If the test fails, we conclude that G admits no planar straight-line realization. Otherwise, Theorem 3 provides us with the desired planar straight-line realization of G . \square

We now extend our study to weighted graphs in which each is assigned with one of two possible lengths. We have the following main theorem.

Theorem 9. *Let $G = (V, E, \lambda)$ be an n -vertex weighted 2-tree, where $\lambda : E \rightarrow \{w_1, w_2\}$ with $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$. There exists an $O(n)$ -time algorithm that tests whether G admits a planar straight-line realization and, in the positive case, constructs such a realization.*

In the remainder of the section, we prove Theorem 9. Hereafter, we assume, w.l.o.g., that $w_1 < w_2$. Note that the realization of any 3-cycle of G is one of the following types of triangles (refer to Fig. 16):

- (i) an equilateral triangle of side w_1 (a *small equilateral triangle*),
- (ii) an equilateral triangle of side w_2 (a *big equilateral triangle*),
- (iii) an isosceles triangle with base w_1 and two sides of length w_2 (a *tall isosceles triangle*), and
- (iv) an isosceles triangle with base w_2 and two sides of length w_1 (a *flat isosceles triangle*).

Any triangle of one of the types above is called an *interesting triangle*.




Fig. 16: The four interesting triangles. Since $w_1 < w_2$, the angles in gray are always less than 60° , while the angles in white are always greater than 60° .

While small equilateral, big equilateral and tall isosceles triangle exist regardless of the values of w_1 and w_2 , flat isosceles triangles do not exist under the condition described in the following property.

Property 9. If $w_2 \geq 2w_1$, then no 3-cycle of G is realized as a flat isosceles triangle.

Proof. By assumption, every 3-cycle of G satisfies the triangle inequality, that is, the sum of the lengths prescribed to any two edges is larger than the length of the third edge. Hence, if $w_2 \geq 2w_1$, then no 3-cycle of G can have two edges with length w_1 and the third edge with length w_2 . \square

5.1 Containment among triangles

The first central ingredient of our algorithm are the conditions satisfied by interesting triangles when they are drawn inside each other in a planar straight-line realization of G . In the following, we denote with r the ratio $\frac{w_2}{w_1} > 1$. Regardless of the value of r , the following lemma holds true.

Lemma 11. *The interesting triangles satisfy the two properties below.*

- a) *No interesting triangle can be drawn inside a small equilateral or a flat isosceles triangle.*
- b) *Neither a big equilateral nor a tall isosceles triangle can be drawn inside any interesting triangle.*

Proof. Let \triangle_1 and \triangle_2 be any two interesting triangles. We make a case by case analysis based on the types of interesting triangles of \triangle_1 and \triangle_2 . In both statement (a) and (b) we have the following common case: If \triangle_1 is the same type of interesting triangle as \triangle_2 , then \triangle_1 and \triangle_2 are congruent, hence neither triangle can be drawn inside the other.

We now prove statement (a). We suppose that \triangle_2 is either small equilateral or flat isosceles, and show that \triangle_1 cannot be drawn inside \triangle_2 regardless of the type of \triangle_1 . We have the following cases:

- \triangle_2 is small equilateral and \triangle_1 is either big equilateral, tall isosceles, or flat isosceles.
In this case \triangle_1 cannot be drawn inside \triangle_2 by Observation 1.
- \triangle_2 is flat isosceles.
 - \triangle_1 is big equilateral.
If \triangle_1 and \triangle_2 do not share any edge, then \triangle_1 cannot be drawn inside \triangle_2 by Observation 1. If instead \triangle_1 and \triangle_2 share an edge, then \triangle_1 cannot be drawn inside \triangle_2 by Property c of Lemma 1.
 - \triangle_1 is tall isosceles.
If \triangle_1 and \triangle_2 do not share any edge, then \triangle_1 cannot be drawn inside \triangle_2 by Observation 1. If instead \triangle_1 and \triangle_2 share an edge, then \triangle_1 cannot be drawn inside \triangle_2 by Property a of Lemma 1.
 - \triangle_1 is small equilateral.
If \triangle_1 and \triangle_2 share an edge, then \triangle_1 cannot be drawn inside \triangle_2 by Property c of Lemma 1. Consider instead that \triangle_1 does not share an edge with \triangle_2 . Let a, b, c be the vertices of \triangle_2 , where \overline{bc} is the side of \triangle_2 with length w_2 ; refer to Fig. 17. Let d be the orthogonal projection of the vertex a on the segment \overline{bc} , let R_1 denote the closed region bounded by the triangle with vertices a, c, d , and let R_2 denote the closed region bounded by the triangle with vertices a, b, d . Since \triangle_2 is flat isosceles, by Property 9 we have $w_2 < 2w_1$, hence the lengths of the segments \overline{bd} , \overline{cd} , and \overline{ad} are all smaller than w_1 . This implies that the only pair of points inside R_1 (resp. inside R_2) at distance greater than or equal to w_1 is (a, c) (resp. (a, b)). Suppose, for a contradiction, that \triangle_1 is contained inside \triangle_2 . Then two vertices of \triangle_1 are contained in the same triangle R_i , say they are contained in R_1 . Since at least one of such two vertices does not coincide with a or c (otherwise \triangle_1 and \triangle_2 would share an edge), the distance between such two vertices is smaller than w_1 , while the length of the edge between them is at least w_1 , a contradiction.




Fig. 17: Illustration for the proof of statement (a) of Lemma 11.

We now prove statement (b). We suppose that \triangle_1 is either big equilateral or tall isosceles, and prove that \triangle_1 cannot be drawn inside \triangle_2 regardless of the type of \triangle_2 . Note that, if \triangle_2 is small equilateral or flat isosceles, then \triangle_1 cannot be drawn inside \triangle_2 by statement (a) of the present lemma. We can hence assume that \triangle_2 is either a big equilateral triangle or a tall isosceles triangle. We have the following cases.

- \triangle_1 and \triangle_2 are of different types of interesting triangles and do not share any edge.
In this case \triangle_1 cannot be drawn inside \triangle_2 by Observation 1.
- \triangle_1 is tall isosceles, \triangle_2 is big equilateral, and \triangle_1 and \triangle_2 share an edge.
In this case \triangle_1 cannot be drawn inside \triangle_2 by Property b of Lemma 1.

- Δ_1 is big equilateral, Δ_2 is tall isosceles, and Δ_1 and Δ_2 share an edge.
In this case Δ_1 cannot be drawn inside Δ_2 by Observation 2.

This concludes the proof of the lemma. □

Let T denote the decomposition tree of G . Suppose that a planar straight-line realization Γ of G exists. The second central ingredient of our algorithm is the next lemma.

Lemma 12. *Let Δ_1 and Δ_2 be two triangles realizing two different 3-cycles of G in Γ . Suppose that Δ_1 is drawn inside Δ_2 . Then Δ_1 is a leaf triangle of T that shares a side with Δ_2 .*

Proof. By statement (a) of Lemma 11, we have that Δ_2 is either big equilateral or tall isosceles. We discuss the two cases separately.

Suppose first that Δ_2 is big equilateral. Consider any interesting triangle Δ_3 that is drawn inside Δ_2 in Γ and shares a side with Δ_2 . Note that Δ_3 is flat isosceles; namely, Δ_3 cannot be tall isosceles or big equilateral by statement (a) of Lemma 11, and it cannot be small equilateral since the sides of Δ_2 have length w_2 . Now suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that an interesting triangle Δ_4 shares a side of length w_1 with Δ_3 . Let v be the common vertex between Δ_2 , Δ_3 , and Δ_4 . If Δ_4 is small equilateral or tall isosceles, as in Fig. 18a with $v = a$, then the sum of the angles at v of Δ_3 and Δ_4 exceeds 60° . Hence Δ_4 crosses Δ_2 , a contradiction. Further, if Δ_4 is flat isosceles, as in Fig. 18a with $v = b$, then Δ_4 crosses Δ_2 by Observation 1. It follows that the only interesting triangles inside Δ_2 are flat isosceles triangles that are leaves of T and that share a side with Δ_2 .

Suppose next that Δ_2 is tall isosceles. The proof follows similar arguments as for the case in which Δ_2 is big equilateral, although, in this case, we distinguish two subcases. Namely, an interesting triangle Δ_3 that is drawn inside Δ_2 and that shares a side with Δ_2 can be either small equilateral (and then it shares a side of length w_1 with Δ_2) as in Fig. 18b, or flat isosceles (and then it shares a side of length w_2 with Δ_2) as in Fig. 19a.




Fig. 18: Two illustrations for the proof of Lemma 12. (a) The case in which Δ_2 is a big equilateral triangle and Δ_3 is a flat isosceles triangle. (b) The case in which Δ_2 is a tall isosceles triangle and Δ_3 is a small equilateral triangle. In both figures, the possible cases for Δ_4 are shown with dashed lines.

Consider first the subcase in which Δ_3 is small equilateral. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that an interesting triangle Δ_4 shares a side of length w_1 with Δ_3 . Let v be the common vertex between Δ_2 , Δ_3 , and Δ_4 . If Δ_4 is small equilateral or tall isosceles, as in Fig. 18b with $v = a$, then the sum of the angles at v of Δ_3 and Δ_4 exceeds 90° . Hence Δ_4 crosses Δ_2 , a contradiction. On the other hand, if Δ_4 is flat isosceles, as in Fig. 18b with $v = b$, then Δ_4 crosses Δ_2 by Observation 1.

Consider next the subcase in which Δ_3 is flat isosceles. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that an interesting triangle Δ_4 shares a side of length w_1 with Δ_3 . Let v be the common vertex between Δ_2 , Δ_3 , and Δ_4 . Let a and b be the vertices incident to the base of Δ_2 , and let c be the third vertex of Δ_2 ; refer to Fig. 19a. The following cases arise depending of whether v is equal to c or a :

- Case 1: $v = c$. If Δ_4 is small equilateral or tall isosceles, then the angle at v of Δ_4 is larger than or equal to 60° , which is larger than the angle at v of Δ_2 . Hence Δ_4 crosses Δ_2 . If Δ_4 is instead flat isosceles, then Δ_4 crosses Δ_2 by Observation 1. In both case we have a contradiction.




Fig. 19: Two illustrations for the proof of Lemma 12, for the case in which Δ_2 is a tall isosceles triangle and Δ_3 is a flat isosceles triangle. (a) The case in which $v = c$ and Δ_4 (in dashed lines) is flat isosceles or tall isosceles, and the case in which $v = a$ and Δ_4 (in dashed lines) is small equilateral. (b) A focus on the case in which $v = a$ and Δ_4 is small equilateral.

- Case 2: $v = a$. If Δ_4 is flat isosceles or tall isosceles, then Δ_4 crosses Δ_2 by Observation 1, a contradiction. Consider that Δ_4 is instead small equilateral, as in Fig. 19a. Let $\angle z$ denote the interior angle of Δ_2 at vertex z , for $z \in \{a, b, c\}$. Let C be the circle with center on a and radius w_1 . The circle cuts the interior of the segment \overline{ac} in a point y and it cuts the interior of the segment \overline{bc} in a point x , since the length of \overline{ac} is $w_2 > w_1$ and since $\angle b < 90^\circ$; see Fig. 19b. If Δ_4 is drawn inside Δ_2 , the vertices of Δ_4 that are different from a lie on the circular arc of C that connects x and y through the interior of Δ_2 . Furthermore, since Δ_4 is equilateral, the internal angle at a of the triangle with vertices a, c, x should be greater than 60° . Let θ denote such angle. We show that θ is actually less than 60° , which is a contradiction. Note that Δ_2 and the triangle with vertices a, b, x are similar to each other, hence $\theta = \angle a - \angle c$. Since $\angle c + 2\angle a = 180^\circ$ we have that

$$\theta = 3\angle a - 180^\circ. \quad (1)$$

On the other hand, we have that $\cos(\angle a) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{w_1}{w_2}$ and, since Δ_1 exists only if $\frac{w_1}{w_2} > \frac{1}{2}$, then $\cos(\angle a) > \frac{1}{4}$. Hence

$$\angle a < \arccos\left(\frac{1}{4}\right) \simeq 75.52^\circ, \quad (2)$$

and from Eqs. (1) and (2) we obtain that $\theta = 3\angle a - 180^\circ \simeq 46.56^\circ < 60^\circ$.

It follows that the only triangles inside Δ_2 are flat isosceles triangles and small equilateral triangles that are leaves of T and that share a side with Δ_2 .

This concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

5.2 Conflicts between leaf triangles

Hereafter, we assume that the decomposition tree T of G is rooted at any 3-cycle whose sum of the edge lengths is maximum. Hence, the triangle realizing such a 3-cycle cannot be drawn inside any other triangle in a planar straight-line realization of G .

The *framework* of G is the subgraph $G_F \subseteq G$ obtained as follows: For each leaf triangle Δ_i that can be drawn inside a triangle Δ_j , which is either its parent or one of its siblings, we remove from G the vertex v

that Δ_i does not share with Δ_j , along with the two edges incident to v . Note that G_F is a 2-tree. Further, by Lemma 12, in any planar straight-line realization Γ of G , the triangles we removed from G in order to define G_F are the only triangles that can be drawn inside other triangles representing 3-cycles of G . It follows that the restriction of Γ to G_F is an outerplanar drawing. Hence, we start by testing if G_F is outerplanar, which can be done in linear time [21,38,50]; in the negative case, we reject the instance. In the positive case, we test whether G_F admits a planar straight-line realization respecting its unique outerplane embedding \mathcal{E} . Both the computation of \mathcal{E} and the test can be performed in linear time using the algorithms in [21,38,50] and Theorem 3, respectively. If the test is negative we reject the instance, otherwise we have a planar straight-line realization Γ_F of G_F with embedding \mathcal{E} .

Let L_Δ denote the set of triangles that were removed from G to obtain G_F . The third central ingredient of our algorithm is a characterization of the conditions under which Γ_F can be extended to a planar straight-line realization of G , by drawing in Γ_F all the triangles of L_Δ .

Let $\Delta = (a, b, c)$ be a triangle of L_Δ such that $e = (a, b)$ is the unique edge shared by Δ and G_F . Suppose we want to add a drawing of Δ to Γ_F . If e is incident to two internal faces of Γ_F , then we call *internal embedding* to each of the two possible drawings of Δ , regardless of whether a, b, c appear in clockwise or counter-clockwise order when traversing Δ . Consider that e is instead incident to one internal face and to the outer face of Γ_F . Suppose that a precedes b in a counter-clockwise traversal of the outer face of Γ_F . If Δ is drawn such that a, b, c appear in clockwise order when traversing Δ , then we call such drawing of Δ an *outer embedding*. Otherwise, we call such drawing of Δ an *internal embedding*.

Consider a straight-line realization Γ of G that *extends* Γ_F ; that is, whose restriction to G_F is Γ_F . Suppose that Γ is not planar. We now classify the possible crossings involving triangles in L_Δ .

First, suppose there is a triangle $\Delta \in L_\Delta$ whose drawing in Γ crosses an edge of Γ_F . If the drawing of Δ is an outer embedding, then we say it induces a *framework conflict*. If the drawing of Δ is instead an internal embedding, then we say it induces an *overlapping conflict*. Second, consider two triangles Δ_i and Δ_j of L_Δ . If the drawings of Δ_i and Δ_j in Γ are both outer embeddings, neither of them induces a framework conflict, and they cross each other, then we say that such drawings induce an *external conflict*. Similarly, if the drawings of Δ_i and Δ_j in Γ are both internal embeddings, neither of them induces an overlapping conflict, and they cross each other, then we say that such drawings induce an *internal conflict*. In both cases, we say that the drawings of Δ_i and Δ_j *conflict with each other*.

We have the following.

Lemma 13. *Let Δ_i and Δ_j be two triangles in L_Δ , and Γ be a straight-line realization of G that extends Γ_F . Suppose that there exists a triangle $\Delta \in \Gamma_F$ such that both Δ_i and Δ_j are drawn inside Δ in Γ . The drawings of Δ_i and Δ_j induce an internal conflict if at least one of the following statements is true:*

- (a) Δ_i and Δ_j share an edge.
- (b) $\sqrt{3} < r \leq 2 \cos(15^\circ) \simeq 1.93$ and Δ is a tall isosceles triangle.
- (c) $1 < r \leq \sqrt{3}$.

Proof. By statement (a) of Lemma 11 and since each of Δ_i and Δ_j is drawn inside Δ , the triangle Δ is either tall isosceles or big equilateral. Furthermore, by statement (b) of Lemma 11, each of Δ_i and Δ_j is either small equilateral or flat isosceles. By Lemma 12, the triangles Δ_i and Δ_j share an edge and so do Δ_i and Δ .

Consider first the case in which Δ_i shares an edge with Δ_j , as described in statement (a). Note that, since G is a 2-tree, the triangles Δ_i , Δ_j , and Δ actually share the same edge. By statement (a) of Lemma 11, Δ_i and Δ_j cannot be drawn inside each other regardless of their types. Since Δ_i and Δ_j are drawn inside the same triangle and they cannot be drawn inside each other, their drawings induce an internal conflict inside Δ . This proves statement (a).

Consider now the case in which Δ_i and Δ_j do not share an edge. The triangles Δ_i and Δ_j induce an internal conflict inside Δ depending on the types of Δ_i , Δ_j , Δ , and the value of r . Note that r is necessarily less than 2 since, otherwise, by Property 9 both Δ_i and Δ_j would be small equilateral triangles and they could not share each a different side of Δ , since Δ has at most one side of length w_1 . By a simple geometric

argument we can deduce that two triangles are drawn inside Δ without inducing internal conflicts in the following cases (refer to Fig. 20):

- (i) If $2 \cos(15^\circ) \simeq 1.93 < r < 2$ and Δ is tall isosceles, then two flat isosceles triangles and one small equilateral triangle can be drawn inside Δ without inducing internal conflicts.
- (ii) If $\sqrt{3} \simeq 1.73 < r < 2$ and Δ is big equilateral, then three flat isosceles can be drawn inside Δ without inducing internal conflicts.

The limit values $r = 2 \cos(15^\circ)$ and $r = \sqrt{3}$ split the interval $1 < r < 2$ into the following three intervals. First, if $2 \cos(15^\circ) < r < 2$, then the cases (i) and (ii) are both possible. Hence, Δ_i and Δ_j can be drawn inside Δ without inducing internal conflicts, regardless of their types. Second, if $\sqrt{3} < r \leq 2 \cos(15^\circ)$ then the case (i) is no longer possible. Hence, as described in statement (b), Δ_i and Δ_j induce an internal conflict inside Δ if Δ is a tall isosceles triangle. Finally, if $1 < r \leq \sqrt{3}$, then none of the cases is possible. Hence, as described in statement (c), Δ_i and Δ_j induce an internal conflict inside Δ regardless of their types. \square




Fig. 20: Illustration for the proof of Lemma 13. The vertices that Δ_i and Δ_j do not share with Δ lie on the circumcenter of Δ . On the left, the case in which Δ is tall isosceles (the segments between the circumcenter of Δ and its vertices all have the same length l). On the right, the case in which Δ is big equilateral.

From Lemma 13 we obtain the following necessary condition for the existence of a planar straight-line realization of G extending Γ_F .

Lemma 14. *If there exists a planar straight-line realization of G , then no subset of three triangles of L_Δ share a side.*

Proof. Suppose, for a contradiction, that there exists a planar straight-line realization Γ of G and that three triangles of L_Δ share an edge e . Consider two of such triangles that are on the same side of e in Γ and denote them by Δ_i and Δ_j . If Δ_i and Δ_j do not cross each other in Γ , then they are contained one inside the other. However, this is not possible by statement (a) of Lemma 11. \square

If L_Δ satisfies the condition stated in Lemma 14, we say that L_Δ is *consistent*.

Lemma 15. *If L_Δ is consistent, then there are $O(1)$ pairs of triangles of L_Δ whose drawings induce an internal conflict inside a triangle $\Delta \in \Gamma_F$.*

Proof. By Lemma 12, all the triangles of L_Δ that can be drawn inside Δ (including those inducing an internal conflict) share an edge with Δ . By Lemma 14 and the assumed consistency of L_Δ , there are at most 6 of such triangles. Hence, the drawings of at most $\binom{6}{2} = 15$ pairs of triangles can induce an internal conflict inside Δ . \square

5.3 The algorithm

We are now ready to describe the algorithm to solve the FEPR problem in $O(n)$ time when the edges of G can only have one of two lengths. The algorithm consists of two stages. In the first stage, we compute the framework G_F of G , and test whether G_F admits a planar straight-line realization Γ_F . Such a realization is constructed in the positive case, and the input instance is rejected otherwise. In the second stage, we test whether Γ_F can be extended to a planar straight-line realization Γ of G , by drawing the triangles of L_Δ without inducing conflicts. In the positive case, we construct and report Γ as the desired realization of G . As before, the input instance is rejected in the negative case. We describe the algorithm in detail next.

Computing a planar straight-line realization Γ_F of the framework of G . The first stage of the algorithm is formed by the following three steps.

Step A. Computing the framework G_F of G and the set L_Δ of leaf triangles. To compute the framework of G we first choose, among all the triangles of G , a triangle Δ_O with maximum sum of the length of its sides. Note that Δ_O cannot be drawn inside any other triangle of G , hence it does not belong to L_Δ . We then compute the decomposition tree T of G rooted at Δ_O . Note that, if G admits a planar straight-line realization, then the degree of T is bounded by a constant. Indeed, each edge of G can be incident to at most two interesting triangles of the same type (and hence each 3-cycle of G can be adjacent to at most 24 distinct 3-cycles). We test whether the degree of T is bounded by 24 in $O(n)$ time. We reject the instance in the negative case. In the positive case we traverse T looking for leaf triangles that can be drawn inside their parent or sibling triangles. By Lemma 12, these are the only triangles in G that can be drawn inside any other triangle. We identify such triangles by means of Observation 2. Since the degree of T is in $O(1)$, each triangle has a constant number of sibling triangles, hence we can compute both G_F and L_Δ in $O(n)$ time.

Step B. Testing if L_Δ is consistent. The next step is to test if L_Δ is consistent. By Lemma 14, this is a necessary condition for the existence of a planar straight-line realization of G . This condition can be trivially tested in $O(n)$ time by looking at the triangles of L_Δ sharing an edge with a parent or a sibling triangle in T . The input instance is rejected in the negative case.

Step C. Constructing a planar straight-line realization Γ_F of G_F . The final step of this stage is to compute a planar straight-line realization of G_F , if it exists. We first test whether G_F is outerplanar. If this is not the case we reject the instance. Otherwise, we construct its unique outerplane embedding in $O(n)$ time [21,38,50]. Then, by means of Theorem 6 we test in $O(n)$ time if G_F admits a planar straight-line realization with the computed embedding. We construct Γ_F in the positive case, and reject the input instance otherwise.

Extending Γ_F to a planar straight-line realization of G . In the second stage the algorithm distinguishes two cases, namely, the one in which $r \geq 2$ and the one in which $r < 2$. In the former case, the algorithm is completed by means of a single step, called D.1, while in the latter case the algorithm is completed by means of four steps, called D.2, E, F, and G.

Case $r \geq 2$. Note that, by Property 9, in this case there are no flat isosceles triangles. Hence, every leaf triangle Δ in L_Δ is a small equilateral triangle such that the parent or a sibling of Δ is a tall isosceles triangle. We act as described in the following step.

Step D.1. Consider each edge e of G_F incident to a triangle in L_Δ . If e is incident to two triangles in L_Δ , we draw them in Γ_F on opposite sides of e . If e is incident to one triangle $\Delta \in L_\Delta$, then we draw Δ inside any tall isosceles triangle incident to e (recall that such a tall isosceles triangle is the parent or a sibling of Δ). At the end of this process we obtain a straight-line realization Γ of G , and a plane embedding \mathcal{E} of G .

Lemma 16. *G admits a planar straight-line realization if and only if Γ is planar.*

Proof. Obviously, if Γ is planar, then it is a planar straight-line realization of G .

We prove that, if G admits a planar straight-line realization, then Γ is planar. Consider an edge $e \in G_F$. Since L_Δ is consistent, the edge e is shared by a set $L_\Delta^e \subseteq L_\Delta$ of at most two leaf triangles. Suppose that e is an internal edge of Γ_F . Then, in Γ , each small equilateral triangle L_Δ^e is drawn as an internal embedding inside a tall isosceles triangle $\Delta^* \in G_F$. Note that no other triangle is drawn inside Δ^* , since a tall isosceles triangle has a single side of length w_1 . Hence, no triangle of L_Δ^e creates a crossing in Γ .

Suppose now that e is incident to the outer face of Γ_F . If L_Δ^e consists of a single triangle, then the triangle is drawn as an internal embedding and, as above, it does not create crossings in Γ . If L_Δ^e consists instead of two triangles, then least one of them, say Δ_s , is drawn as an outer embedding. However, the two triangles in L_Δ^e are drawn on different sides of e in any planar straight-line realization of G , hence if Δ_s creates a crossing, it does so in every straight-line realization of G . Since a planar straight-line realization of G exists by hypothesis, it follows that Δ_s does not create crossings in Γ , and hence Γ is planar. \square

Observe that Γ and \mathcal{E} are constructed in linear time. We test whether Γ is a planar straight-line realization of G with embedding \mathcal{E} in $O(n)$ time by means of Theorem 3. By Lemma 16, in the negative case we conclude that G admits no planar straight-line realization, otherwise Γ is the desired planar straight-line realization of G .

Case $r < 2$. The algorithm in this case is more complicated, since there might be flat isosceles triangles in G , which might or might not need to be embedded inside their adjacent large equilateral or tall isosceles triangles in Γ_F . Moreover, more than a single leaf triangle might be drawn inside the same interesting triangle of Γ_F .

An example of a planar straight-line realization of a weighted 2-tree for which $r < 2$ is shown in Fig. 21. The values of w_1 and w_2 were chosen so that $\sqrt{3} \simeq 1.73 < r \leq 2 \cos(15^\circ) \simeq 1.93$. By Property b of Lemma 13, a pair of flat isosceles triangles can be drawn inside a big equilateral triangle without crossing each other, but any pair of interesting triangles (either two flat isosceles or a flat isosceles and a small equilateral) cross with each other if they are drawn inside a tall isosceles triangle. The triangles of Γ_F are drawn with thick lines, and the edges of the leaf triangles of L_Δ that are not part of Γ_F are drawn with thin lines. Observe that any type of interesting triangle can belong to the framework, whereas the triangles of L_Δ are either small equilateral or flat isosceles triangles. If a leaf triangle is small equilateral, then it is adjacent to (at least) an interesting triangle of the frame that is tall isosceles. If it is instead a flat isosceles, then it is adjacent to (at least) an interesting triangle of the frame that is either tall isosceles or big equilateral.

From Lemma 12, a leaf triangle can be drawn inside its parent triangle, a sibling triangle, or both. In our example, Δ_2 can be drawn both inside its parent triangle Δ_1 and inside the sibling triangle Δ_3 . On the other hand, Δ_{18} can only be drawn inside its parent triangle Δ_{17} , and Δ_{21} can only be drawn inside its sibling triangle Δ_{22} . Consider the triangle Δ_{27} . It can only be drawn inside its parent triangle Δ_3 since it is congruent to its sibling triangle Δ_8 . Hence it would induce an overlapping conflict if it were drawn on the same side as Δ_8 . Consider now the interesting triangles drawn with dashed lines. If Δ_9 was drawn inside Δ_{17} , then Δ_9 and Δ_{18} would cross each other. On the other hand, if the drawing of Δ_{16} is an outer embedding, then it would induce a framework conflict. Finally, if the drawings of both Δ_{13} and Δ_6 are outer embeddings, then they would induce an external conflict.

To deal with this case we proceed as follows. First, we compute the pairs of triangles whose drawings may induce a conflict. Then we construct a 2SAT formula ϕ that contains a Boolean variable for each triangle $\Delta \in L_\Delta$. The value of the variable is associated to a choice of the two possible drawings of Δ : recall that an edge of Δ is part of G_F , while the vertex of Δ not incident to such an edge might be placed on either side of it. For each triangle Δ that induces a framework or an overlapping conflict in one of its two drawings, there is a clause in ϕ that is **True** if and only if the drawing of the triangle is not the one inducing a conflict. Similarly, for each pair of triangles whose drawings induce an internal or an external conflict, there is a clause in ϕ that is **True** if and only if the drawings of the triangles are not both the ones inducing a conflict. If ϕ is satisfiable, then there is a planar straight-line realization of G which can be obtained by embedding the triangles of L_Δ according to the values of the variables of ϕ . We reject the instance otherwise. We describe the algorithm in detail next.




Fig. 21: A planar straight-line realization of a weighted 2-tree for $\sqrt{3} < r \leq 2 \cos(15^\circ)$. On the left, the planar straight-line realization. Triangles in the framework are drawn with thick lines. On the right, the decomposition tree rooted at Δ_1 .

Step D.2. Detecting internal conflicts. We start by computing all the pairs of triangles of L_Δ that induce an internal conflict. This is done by traversing T while processing each triangle $\Delta \in \Gamma_F$ as follows. We first obtain the set $L'_\Delta \subseteq L_\Delta$ of leaf triangles that can be drawn inside Δ . By Lemma 12, these triangles share an edge with Δ , so they are children or siblings of Δ . We then decide which pairs of leaf triangles of L'_Δ induce an internal conflict inside Δ , by means of Lemma 13. Since L_Δ is consistent, by Lemma 15 there are $O(1)$ triangles in L'_Δ . Hence, we process each triangle in $O(1)$ time, and the traversal takes $O(n)$ time.

Step E. Detecting overlapping conflicts. Next, for each triangle $\Delta \in L_\Delta$, we detect whether any of its two drawings induces an overlapping conflict. Let Δ^* be the parent of Δ in T and let e be the edge shared by Δ and Δ^* . Note that, since $\Delta \in L_\Delta$, one of the two drawings of Δ lies inside Δ^* and hence does not induce an overlapping conflict. We first check whether the other drawing of Δ is an internal or an outer embedding (in the latter case, we can conclude that Δ does not induce an overlapping conflict). This is equivalent to checking whether there is a triangle Δ_s in Γ_F on the other side of e with respect to Δ^* . Note that, if such a triangle Δ_s exists, then it is a sibling of Δ in T , given that it shares the edge e with Δ and that it is not the parent Δ^* of Δ . Hence, for each of the $O(1)$ siblings of Δ in T , we check in $O(1)$ time whether it is a triangle in Γ_F and whether it is incident to e . If no sibling of Δ in T satisfies both checks, then we conclude that no drawing of Δ induces an overlapping conflict. Otherwise, there is a sibling of Δ in T that satisfies both checks; then this sibling is the desired triangle Δ_s and hence the drawing of Δ outside Δ^* is an internal embedding of Δ . Then we also check in $O(1)$ time whether Δ_s and the drawing of Δ outside Δ^* cross each other. In the positive case, we conclude that the drawing of Δ outside Δ^* induces an overlapping conflict, while in the negative case we conclude that it does not. Since we process each triangle $\Delta \in L_\Delta$ in $O(1)$ time, this step takes $O(n)$ time.

Step F. Detecting framework and external conflicts. Detecting framework and external conflicts in linear time is more challenging than overlapping and internal conflicts. Indeed, an outer embedding of a triangle $\Delta \in L_\Delta$ might cross a triangle of Γ_F or the outer embedding of a triangle in L_Δ that is far, in terms of

graph-theoretic distance, from Δ . Hence, the trivial solution would detect framework and external conflicts by comparing each triangle $\Delta \in L_\Delta$ with every triangle of Γ_F and with every triangle in L_Δ . However, this would result in a quadratic running time. In order to achieve linear running time, we decompose the plane into cells and then derive several combinatorial properties of such a decomposition, including: (i) only a linear number of cells can host conflicts and such cells can be found efficiently; (ii) conflicts can only occur between triangles in a single cell or in adjacent cells; and (iii) each cell can host only a constant number of outer embeddings of triangles from L_Δ . The last property is only true because of the assumption $r < 2$. We now describe the details of Step F.

Let L'_Δ be the subset of L_Δ composed of those triangles that are incident to external edges of Γ_F . Only the outer embeddings of the triangles in L'_Δ can induce framework and external conflicts. We translate the Cartesian axes so that the bottom-left corner of the bounding box of Γ_F lies on the origin, and give an outer embedding to every triangle in L'_Δ . This results in a possibly non-planar straight-line realization Γ'_F of the graph $G'_F := G_F \cup L'_\Delta$. Our strategy to detect external and framework conflicts is based on the construction of a linear-size “proximity” graph H defined on the vertices of G'_F . We show that, if two triangles of L'_Δ induce an external conflict, then their vertices are associated either with the same node or with adjacent nodes of H . Similarly, if a triangle $\Delta \in L'_\Delta$ induces a framework conflict by intersecting an edge e of G'_F , then the vertices of Δ and the end-vertices of e are associated either with the same node or with adjacent nodes of H . We then detect external and framework conflicts by a linear-time traversal of H .

In the following, we say that a vertex of G_F is a *framework vertex* and a vertex of L'_Δ that is not contained in G_F is a *leaf vertex*. For each leaf vertex v , we denote with $\Delta(v)$ the outer embedding of the triangle in L'_Δ whose leaf vertex is v . We define the graph H as follows. Consider a square grid whose cells have side length $3w_2$ covering the plane; see Fig. 22. We assign a label $l(v) = (i, j)$ to every vertex $v \in V(G'_F)$, where i and j respectively denote the row and the column of one of the (at most four) grid cells that contain v in their interior or on their boundary. More precisely, the vertex v gets the label $(\lfloor \frac{x(v)}{3w_2} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{y(v)}{3w_2} \rfloor)$, where $(x(v), y(v))$ denotes the coordinates of v in Γ'_F . The graph H has a node for each label assigned to at least one vertex of G'_F , and two nodes (i, j) and (i', j') are connected if and only if $|i - i'| \leq 1$ and $|j - j'| \leq 1$. Note that H has at most n nodes and maximum degree 8, hence it has $O(n)$ edges. We say that a vertex of G'_F is *associated with* a node μ of H if μ represents the cell (i, j) and $l(v) = (i, j)$.




Fig. 22: On the left, the straight-line realization Γ'_F of the graph $G'_F := G_F \cup L'_\Delta$, where each triangle in L'_Δ has an outer embedding. The triangles of G_F are shown in gray, and the outer embeddings of the triangles in L'_Δ are shown in white. Framework vertices are shown in white and leaf vertices are shown in blue. The grid cell filled with dashed lines is zoomed-in on the right. All the triangles in L'_Δ contained in this cell can induce external or framework conflicts only with the triangles contained in the nine highlighted cells.

Lemma 17. *The graph H satisfies the following properties:*

- (a) *For each node μ of H , there are $O(1)$ leaf vertices associated with μ .*
- (b) *Let Δ_1, Δ_2 be two triangles in L'_Δ . For $i = 1, 2$, let μ_i denote a node of H such that at least one vertex of Δ_i is associated with μ . If the outer embeddings of Δ_1 and Δ_2 induce an external conflict, then either $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ or $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in E(H)$.*
- (c) *Let Δ be a triangle in L'_Δ , and e be an edge of G_F incident to the outer face of Γ_F . Let μ and ν denote two nodes of H such that at least one vertex of Δ is associated with μ and at least one end-vertex of e is associated with ν . If the outer embedding of Δ induces a framework conflict by intersecting e , then either $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ or $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in E(H)$.*

Proof. Consider any leaf vertex v associated with a node μ of H . Let (i, j) be the cell corresponding to μ and Δ be the parent triangle of the triangle in L'_Δ that has v as a vertex. By statement (b) of Lemma 11, we have that Δ is either a big equilateral or a tall isosceles triangle. Further, Δ is contained in the union of the nine cells (i', j') for $|i - i'| \leq 1$ and $|j - j'| \leq 1$ (see the highlighted cells in Fig. 22); this is because the Euclidean distance between v and every point of Δ is smaller than $2w_2$, while the side length of a grid cell is $3w_2$. Observe that the area of a big equilateral or tall isosceles triangle is larger than the area of a small equilateral triangle, which is equal to $w_1^2\sqrt{3}/4$. Moreover, any two parent triangles are interior-disjoint in Γ'_F . Since the area of the union of the nine cells is $81w_2^2$, then at most $81w_2^2 \frac{4}{w_1^2\sqrt{3}} = \frac{324}{\sqrt{3}} \left(\frac{w_2}{w_1}\right)^2 \in O(r^2)$ parent triangles are contained in the nine cells, and $O(r^2)$ leaf vertices are associated with μ . Since $r < 2$, we have $O(r^2) \in O(1)$. This proves Property (a).

To prove Property (b), suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that the outer embeddings of Δ_1 and Δ_2 induce an external conflict, with $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$ and $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \notin E(H)$. Since Δ_1 and Δ_2 induce an external conflict, then there is at least a point x in $\Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2$. Note that x is at distance smaller than or equal to w_2 from the vertices of Δ_1 and Δ_2 , which implies that every vertex of Δ_1 is at distance smaller than or equal to $2w_2$ from any vertex of Δ_2 . Since there is a distance larger than or equal to $3w_2$ between two vertices of G'_F associated to non-adjacent nodes of H , then either $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ or $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in E(H)$, which is a contradiction.

Finally, Property (c) can be proved by similar arguments to those we used to prove Property (b). \square

In order to detect external and framework conflicts, we define each node μ of H representing the cell (i, j) as a record storing (i) a label $l(\mu) = (i, j)$ and (ii) a list $L(\mu)$ that contains the vertices of G'_F associated with μ . We next describe an efficient algorithm to construct H .

Lemma 18. *The graph H can be constructed in $O(n)$ time.*

Proof. We first show how to construct the vertex set $V(H)$ of H .

Consider a total order π of the vertices of G'_F such that, for any two vertices u and v with $l(u) = (i_u, j_u)$ and $l(v) = (i_v, j_v)$, it holds that u precedes v in the order if (i) $i_u < i_v$ or (ii) $i_u = i_v$ and $j_u < j_v$; if $i_u = i_v$ and $j_u = j_v$, then u and v are in any relative order in π . Since G'_F is connected and any edge of G'_F has length at most w_2 , then $i, j \leq \frac{w_2 n}{3w_2} = \frac{1}{3}n$ for any label (i, j) . Hence, we can compute π in $O(n)$ time by means of counting sort.

We process the vertices of G'_F in the order in which they appear in π . Let s be the first vertex in the order π . We create a node ν of H , set $l(\nu) = l(s)$, and add s to $L(\nu)$. Let now v be the currently considered vertex of π and let us denote by μ the last created node of H . If $l(v) = l(\mu)$, then we add v to $L(\mu)$; otherwise, we create a node μ' of H , set $l(\mu') = l(v)$, and add v to $L(\mu')$. Note that, if two vertices of G'_F have the same label, then they are consecutive in π . Therefore, the above procedure creates a new node of H for each label of a vertex of G'_F , and vertices with the same label (i, j) are all placed in the list $L(\mu)$ of the node μ such that $l(\mu) = (i, j)$. The procedure can clearly be performed in overall $O(n)$ time.

We now show how to construct the edge set $E(H)$ of H .

We define a partition of $E(H)$ into four subsets $E_-, E_1, E_j, E_\setminus$; refer to Fig. 23. Consider any edge $(\mu, \nu) \in E(H)$, where we denote $l(\mu) = (i_\mu, j_\mu)$ and $l(\nu) = (i_\nu, j_\nu)$. Then (μ, ν) belongs to E_-, E_1, E_j , or E_\setminus , depending on whether (μ, ν) satisfies Property P_-, P_1, P_j , or P_\setminus , respectively, where:




Fig. 23: Construction of the set of edges $E(H)$. The edges on the sets E_- , E_+ , $E_/\$, and E_\backslash are shown in yellow, blue, green, and red, respectively.

- P_- : $i_\mu = i_\nu$ and $|j_\mu - j_\nu| = 1$,
 P_+ : $j_\mu = j_\nu$ and $|i_\mu - i_\nu| = 1$,
 $P_/\$: either $i_\mu - i_\nu = j_\mu - j_\nu = 1$ or $i_\mu - i_\nu = j_\mu - j_\nu = -1$, and
 P_\backslash : either $i_\mu - i_\nu = 1$ and $j_\mu - j_\nu = -1$ or $i_\mu - i_\nu = -1$ and $j_\mu - j_\nu = 1$.

In order to construct the sets E_- , E_+ , $E_/\$, and E_\backslash , we define four total orders π_- , π_+ , $\pi_/\$, and π_\backslash of the nodes of H , respectively. For any two nodes μ and ν of H , it holds that μ precedes ν in π_- , π_+ , $\pi_/\$, and π_\backslash if and only if the following conditions hold, respectively:

- C_- : either $i_\mu < i_\nu$ or $i_\mu = i_\nu$ and $j_\mu < j_\nu$,
 C_+ : either $j_\mu < j_\nu$ or $j_\mu = j_\nu$ and $i_\mu < i_\nu$,
 $C_/\$: either $i_\mu - j_\mu < i_\nu - j_\nu$ or $i_\mu - j_\mu = i_\nu - j_\nu$ and $i_\mu < i_\nu$, or
 C_\backslash : either $i_\mu + j_\mu < i_\nu + j_\nu$ or $i_\mu + j_\mu = i_\nu + j_\nu$ and $i_\mu < i_\nu$.

We construct the set E_i with $i \in \{-, |, /, \backslash\}$ as follows. First, we compute the total order π_i of the nodes of H for which condition C_i holds for any pair (μ, ν) of nodes such that μ precedes ν in π_i . Similarly as in the construction of π , the order π_i can be computed in $O(n)$ time by means of counting sort. Then we process the nodes of $V(H)$ in the order π_i and add a new edge (μ, ν) to E_i whenever condition P_i holds for two nodes μ and ν such that μ immediately precedes ν in π_i . Since, by construction, nodes that are adjacent in E_i are consecutive in π_i , it follows that the above procedure correctly computes each set E_i . Clearly, the procedure can be performed in overall $O(n)$ time. This concludes the construction of H . \square

We now describe an algorithm, which we call CONFLICTFINDER, to detect external and framework conflicts. Broadly speaking, the algorithm performs two linear-time traversals of the edges of H . In the first traversal, we detect external conflicts. When processing the edge $(\mu, \nu) \in E(H)$ we detect intersections between the triangles of L'_Δ whose leaf vertices are contained in $L(\mu) \cup L(\nu)$. In the second traversal, we detect framework conflicts. In this case, when processing the edge $(\mu, \nu) \in E(H)$ we detect intersections between the triangles of L'_Δ and the edges of G'_F whose leaf and framework end-vertices, respectively, are contained in $L(\mu) \cup L(\nu)$.

The algorithm consists of the following steps:

- Step 1:** Compute the drawing Γ'_F of G'_F and the auxiliary graph H as described above.
Step 2: For every framework vertex v , create the list $L_E(v)$ of the two edges of Γ'_F incident to both v and the outer face of Γ'_F .

- Step 3:** For every node $\mu \in V(H)$, create the lists $L_\ell(\mu)$ and $L_F(\mu)$ of leaf and framework vertices contained in $L(\mu)$, respectively.
- Step 4:** Detect which triangles of L'_Δ induce external conflicts as follows. Let $\mathcal{E}_\ell = \{(u, v) \in L_\ell(\mu) \times \{L_\ell(\mu) \cup L_\ell(\nu)\} \mid (\mu, \nu) \in E(H)\}$. For every pair of vertices $(u, v) \in \mathcal{E}_\ell$, test if $\Delta(u)$ and $\Delta(v)$ intersect each other. In the positive case, the triangles $\Delta(u)$ and $\Delta(v)$ induce an external conflict.
- Step 5:** Detect which triangles of L'_Δ induce framework conflicts as follows. Let $\mathcal{E}_F = \{(u, v) \in L_F(\mu) \times \{L_\ell(\mu) \cup L_\ell(\nu)\} \mid (\mu, \nu) \in E(H)\}$. For every pair of vertices $(u, v) \in \mathcal{E}_F$, test if there is an edge $e \in L_E(u)$ such that e intersects $\Delta(v)$. In the positive case, the triangle $\Delta(v)$ induces a framework conflict with the edge e .

The correctness and complexity of the algorithm are proved in the following lemma.

Lemma 19. *The algorithm CONFLICTFINDER detects all the external and framework conflicts in $O(n)$ time.*

Proof. We first prove the correctness of the algorithm. Consider first the detection of external conflicts. Let u and v be two leaf vertices associated respectively to two nodes μ and ν . Remember that $\Delta(u)$ and $\Delta(v)$ induce an external conflict if and only if they intersect each other. Then, by Property (b) of Lemma 17, we have that either $\mu = \nu$ or $(\mu, \nu) \in E(H)$. Since in Step 4 the algorithm processes each pair of leaf triangles whose leaf vertices are associated with the same node of H or with adjacent nodes of H , it follows that all the external conflicts are being detected.

Consider now the detection of framework conflicts. Let u be a framework vertex associated to a node μ , let v be a leaf vertex associated to a node ν , and e be an edge in $L_E(u)$. Remember that $\Delta(v)$ induces a framework conflict with e if and only if $\Delta(v)$ and e intersect each other. Then, by Property (c) of Lemma 17, we have that either $\mu = \nu$ or $(\mu, \nu) \in E(H)$. Since in Step 5 the algorithm processes each pair composed of a framework and a leaf vertex that are associated either with the same node of H or with adjacent nodes of H , it follows that all the framework conflicts are being detected.

We now bound the time complexity of the algorithm. This is done by bounding the time complexity of each of the Steps 1–5.

- Since there are $O(n)$ triangles in L'_Δ , we have that Γ_F can be extended to Γ'_F in $O(n)$ time. Furthermore, the graph H can be computed in $O(n)$ time by Lemma 18. Hence Step 1 takes $O(n)$ time.
- Step 2 takes $O(n)$ time since the boundary of the outer face of Γ_F consists of $O(n)$ line segments.
- Step 3 takes also $O(n)$ time, since H has at most n nodes, and every vertex v of G'_F is contained in the list $L(\mu)$ of a single node μ of H .
- The time complexity of Step 4 is bounded by $O(|\mathcal{E}_\ell|)$. Note that H contains $O(n)$ edges; moreover, for every node μ of H , the list $L_\ell(\mu)$ contains $O(1)$ leaf vertices, by Property (a) of Lemma 17. Hence \mathcal{E}_ℓ contains $O(n)$ pairs of vertices and Step 4 takes $O(n)$ time.
- Finally, the time complexity of Step 5 is bounded by $O(|\mathcal{E}_F|)$. In this case, even though $\Theta(n)$ framework vertices might be associated with the same node of H , each framework vertex appears in $O(1)$ pairs of \mathcal{E}_F ; namely, if a framework vertex u is associated with a node μ of H , then it only appears in the pairs (u, v) of \mathcal{E}_F such that the leaf vertex v is associated either with μ or with one of the (at most 8) neighbors of μ in H . By Property (a) of Lemma 17, there are $O(1)$ leaf vertices associated with the same node of H , hence \mathcal{E}_F contains $O(n)$ pairs of vertices and Step 5 takes $O(n)$ time.

This concludes the proof of the time complexity and hence the proof of the lemma. \square

Step G. Extending Γ_F to a planar straight-line realization of G . The final step is to draw the triangles of L_Δ in Γ_F without inducing conflicts, so that the resulting drawing remains planar. We decide if this is possible by means of a 2SAT formula. Each leaf triangle $\Delta_i \in L_\Delta$ can have two embeddings (which differ from each other for the position of the leaf vertex of Δ_i). We arbitrarily associate each embedding with a distinct truth value of a suitable Boolean variable, and construct the clauses of the formula as follows:

- If a drawing of Δ_i induces an overlapping conflict, then we introduce a clause $(\neg \ell_i)$, where ℓ_i is the literal that is **True** when Δ_i has the drawing that induces an overlapping conflict.

- If Δ_i induces a framework conflict, we introduce a clause $(\neg \ell_i)$, where ℓ_i is the literal that is **True** when Δ_i has an outer embedding.
- If two leaf triangles $\Delta_i, \Delta_j \in L_\Delta$ induce an internal conflict inside a triangle $\Delta \in \Gamma_F$, we introduce a clause $(\neg \ell_i \vee \neg \ell_j)$, where ℓ_i (resp. ℓ_j) is the literal that is **True** when Δ_i (resp. Δ_j) is drawn inside Δ .
- If two leaf triangles $\Delta_i, \Delta_j \in L_\Delta$ induce an external conflict, we introduce a clause $(\neg \ell_i \vee \neg \ell_j)$, where ℓ_i (resp. ℓ_j) is the literal that is **True** when Δ_i (resp. Δ_j) has an outer embedding.

Let ϕ be the 2SAT formula produced by the clauses introduced as described above. Clearly, the clauses of ϕ describe all and only the overlapping, framework, internal, and external conflicts defined in Section 5.2. Moreover, since there are $O(n)$ triangles in L_Δ , the number of framework and overlapping conflicts is in $O(n)$. Further, since H has $O(n)$ vertices and edges, by Lemmas 15 and 17 the number of internal and external conflicts is in $O(n)$, respectively. It follows that ϕ contains $O(n)$ clauses. The following lemma shows that a solution to ϕ corresponds to a planar straight-line realization of G .

Lemma 20. *The formula ϕ is satisfiable if and only if Γ_F can be extended to a planar straight-line realization of G . Also, if ϕ is satisfiable, then such a planar straight-line realization can be constructed in $O(n)$ time.*

Proof. We prove the two directions separately.

(\implies) Assume that ϕ is satisfiable. We show that Γ_F can be extended to a planar straight-line realization of G . Consider a truth assignment for the Boolean variables that satisfies ϕ . The variables of ϕ are in one to one correspondence with the triangles of L_Δ . We draw in Γ_F each triangle $\Delta_i \in L_\Delta$ with the embedding associated with the truth value of the variable corresponding to Δ_i in the satisfying assignment for ϕ . This can clearly be done in $O(1)$ time per triangle in L_Δ , hence in overall $O(n)$ time. Since each clause of ϕ is satisfied, it follows that Δ_i is drawn in Γ_F without inducing conflicts. Since this is true for every $\Delta_i \in L_\Delta$, it follows that the resulting straight-line realization of G is planar. Furthermore, such a realization can be constructed in $O(n)$ time since there are $O(n)$ clauses in ϕ .

(\impliedby) Let Γ be a planar straight-line realization of G . We show that ϕ is satisfiable. The embedding in Γ of each triangle $\Delta_i \in L_\Delta$ identifies a truth value for the corresponding variable in ϕ , and thus, a truth assignment for ϕ . Such an assignment satisfies ϕ since an unsatisfied clause would imply that we have either an overlapping, or a framework, or an internal, or an external conflict, which in turn implies that the boundary of some triangle $\Delta_i \in L_\Delta$ crosses the boundary of a triangle of Γ_F or the boundary of another triangle of L_Δ , contradicting the fact that Γ is planar. This concludes the proof. \square

By the discussion in Steps D.2, E, and F, we have that ϕ can be constructed in $O(n)$ time. Further, as argued above, ϕ contains $O(n)$ clauses. We can therefore test whether ϕ is satisfiable in $O(n)$ time [6]. If ϕ is not satisfiable, we reject the instance. Otherwise, we extend Γ_F to a planar straight-line realization of G in $O(n)$ time as described in the proof of Lemma 20. This concludes the proof of Theorem 9.

6 Maximal Outerplanar Graphs

In this section we study the FEPR problem for weighted outerplanar 2-trees, that is, for weighted maximal outerplanar graphs. While we could not establish the computational complexity of the FEPR problem for general maximal outerplanar graphs, we can prove the following two theorems.

Theorem 10. *Let G be an n -vertex weighted maximal outerpath. There exists an $O(n)$ -time algorithm that tests whether G admits a planar straight-line realization and, in the positive case, constructs such a realization.*

Theorem 11. *Let G be an n -vertex weighted maximal outerpillar. There exists an $O(n^3)$ -time algorithm that tests whether G admits a planar straight-line realization and, in the positive case, constructs such a realization.*




Fig. 24: (a) and (b) show two e -outer realizations Γ and Γ' of a weighted 2-tree. The gray regions show \mathcal{I}_Γ and $\mathcal{I}_{\Gamma'}$. We have that Γ is e -smaller than Γ' . Indeed, as shown in (c), Γ can be rotated, translated, and reflected so that the representation of e coincides with the one in Γ' and so that its interior is a subset of the interior of Γ' .

Before proving Theorems 10 and 11, we establish some notation and definitions that are common to both proofs. Let G be a weighted 2-tree. For a planar straight-line realization Γ of G , the *interior* of Γ , denoted by \mathcal{I}_Γ , is the complement of the outer face of Γ , i.e., the union of the closure of the internal faces of Γ . Let e be an edge of G . An *e -outer realization* of G is a planar straight-line realization of G such that e is incident to its outer face. Given two e -outer realizations Γ and Γ' of G , we say that Γ is *e -smaller than Γ'* if there exists an e -outer realization Γ'' that can be obtained by a rigid transformation of Γ such that the end-vertices of e lie at the same points in Γ'' and in Γ' and such that $\mathcal{I}_{\Gamma''} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\Gamma'}$ (see Fig. 24); that is Γ is e -smaller than Γ' if it can be rotated, translated, and possibly reflected so that the representation of e coincides with the one in Γ' and so that its interior is a subset of the interior of Γ' . A set \mathcal{R} of e -outer realizations of G is *e -optimal* if, for every e -outer realization Γ' of G , there exists an e -outer realization Γ of G in \mathcal{R} such that Γ is e -smaller than Γ' . An e -outer realization Γ of G is *e -optimal* if the set $\{\Gamma\}$ is e -optimal.

The following lemma will be very useful; see Fig. 25. Roughly speaking, it asserts that, in order to construct a planar straight-line realization of a weighted 2-tree, for certain subgraphs it is not a loss of generality to use realizations that are “as e -small as possible”.

Lemma 21. *Let G be a weighted 2-tree that admits a planar straight-line realization \mathcal{G} . Let H and K be two subgraphs of G that satisfy the following properties:*

- H and K are weighted 2-trees;
- $H \cup K = G$ (that is, every vertex and edge of G is in H or in K);
- $H \cap K = e$ (that is, H and K share an edge e , the end-vertices of e , and no other edge or vertex);
- the restriction \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{G} to H is an e -outer realization of H ; and
- no vertex of K lies inside an internal face of \mathcal{H} in \mathcal{G} .

Let \mathcal{H}' be any e -outer realization of H that is e -smaller than \mathcal{H} . Then it is possible to replace \mathcal{H} with an e -outer realization of H that can be obtained by a rigid transformation of \mathcal{H}' in such a way that the resulting straight-line realization of G is planar.

Proof. Let \mathcal{K} be the restriction of \mathcal{G} to K . Assume that H has more than two vertices, as otherwise H contains a single edge, hence \mathcal{H}' can be obtained by a rigid transformation of \mathcal{H} and the statement is trivial. By assumption, no vertex of K lies in $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{H}}$; further, H is biconnected, by Property (P1) of a 2-tree. It follows that there is a face f of \mathcal{K} that contains \mathcal{H} entirely, except for the edge e and its end-vertices, which are shared by H and K . By assumption, there exists an e -outer realization \mathcal{H}'' of H that can be obtained by a rigid transformation of \mathcal{H}' such that $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{H}''} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{H}}$, hence the part of \mathcal{H}'' different from the edge e does not intersect \mathcal{K} ; the edge e does not intersect \mathcal{K} either, as it is part of it and \mathcal{K} is planar. Hence, the straight-line realization of G resulting from the replacement of \mathcal{H} with \mathcal{H}'' in \mathcal{G} is planar. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorems 10 and 11.




Fig. 25: (a) The drawing \mathcal{G} ; the set $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is shaded gray. The region with dark gray stripes is the face f of \mathcal{K} . (b) The drawing obtained from \mathcal{G} by replacing \mathcal{H} with \mathcal{H}'' ; the set $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{H}''}$ is gray.

Proof of Theorem 10. Let $G = (V, E, \lambda)$ be an n -vertex weighted maximal outerpath (as the one in Fig. 26) and let \mathcal{O} be its outerplane embedding, which can be found in $O(n)$ time [21,38,50]. Since G is an outerpath, its dual tree is a path, which we denote by $P := (p_1, \dots, p_k)$, where $k = n - 2$; note that P can be easily recovered from \mathcal{O} in $O(n)$ time. Each node p_i of P corresponds to an internal face of \mathcal{O} ; we denote by c_i the 3-cycle of G bounding such a face; each cycle c_i has a unique (planar) straight-line realization (up to a rigid transformation), which we denote by \mathcal{C}_i . Further, for $i = 1, \dots, k - 1$, let e_i be the edge of G that is dual to the edge (p_i, p_{i+1}) of P ; note that e_i is an internal edge of \mathcal{O} .




Fig. 26: The outerplane embedding of an outerpath. The gray face is the one bounded by c_x . The graphs G_1 and G_2 are enclosed inside fat curves.

Let $x \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ be an index such that the sum of the lengths of the edges of c_x is maximum. Let G_1 be the subgraph of G composed of the 3-cycles c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{x-1} and let G_2 be the subgraph of G composed of the 3-cycles $c_{x+1}, c_{x+2}, \dots, c_k$. One of these graphs might be undefined if $x = 1$ or $x = k$; however, in the following, we assume that $1 < x < k$ as the arguments for the cases $x = 1$ and $x = k$ are analogous and actually simpler. Note that G_1 and G_2 are maximal outerpaths.

Assume that a planar straight-line realization Γ of G exists; for $i = 1, 2$, let Γ_i be the restriction of Γ to G_i . Since the sum of the lengths of the edges of c_x is maximum among all the 3-cycles of G , it follows that c_x does not lie inside any 3-cycle of G in Γ ; hence, Γ_1 is an e_{x-1} -outer realization of G_1 and Γ_2 is an e_x -outer realization of G_2 .

A key ingredient of our algorithm is the fact that, if there exists an e_{x-1} -outer realization of G_1 (resp. an e_x -outer realization of G_2), then there exists an e_{x-1} -optimal realization of G_1 (resp. an e_x -optimal realization of G_2). Indeed, in the following, we show an $O(n)$ -time algorithm that either (i) concludes that G_1 admits no e_{x-1} -outer realization or that G_2 admits no e_x -outer realization, and thus G admits no planar straight-line realization, or (ii) constructs an e_{x-1} -optimal realization Γ_1 of G_1 and its plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1)$, and an e_x -optimal realization Γ_2 of G_2 and its plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2)$.

In view of the argument above, the existence of such an algorithm suffices to conclude the proof of the theorem. Indeed, if the algorithm concludes that G_1 admits no e_{x-1} -outer realization or that G_2 admits no e_x -outer realization, then G admits no planar straight-line realization. Otherwise, the algorithm constructs

an e_{x-1} -optimal realization Γ_1 of G_1 , together with its plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1)$, and an e_x -optimal realization Γ_2 of G_2 , together with its plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2)$. Then, in order to test whether G admits a planar straight-line realization, we consider the unique (up to a rigid transformation) planar straight-line realization \mathcal{C}_x of c_x and we try to combine it with Γ_1 and Γ_2 (see Fig. 27). This combination can be done in four ways. Indeed, once Γ_1 and \mathcal{C}_x coincide on the representation of e_{x-1} , it still remains to decide whether the vertex of c_{x-1} not incident to e_{x-1} and the vertex of c_x not incident to e_{x-1} lie on different sides or on the same side of the line through e_{x-1} , and similarly for Γ_2 and \mathcal{C}_x . These two independent choices result in four straight-line realizations of G . Each of these realizations, say Γ , can be constructed in $O(n)$ time; further, its plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$ can also be constructed in $O(n)$ time from $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2)$. Then it can be tested in $O(n)$ time whether Γ is a planar straight-line realization respecting $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$, due to Theorem 3. If (at least) one of the four realizations is planar, then it is the desired planar straight-line realization of G . Otherwise, we claim that there exists no planar straight-line realization of G . For a contradiction, assume that there exists such a realization, and denote it by Γ . Since Γ_1 is e_{x-1} -optimal, it is e_{x-1} -smaller than the restriction of Γ to G_1 ; hence, we can apply Lemma 21 with $H = G_1$, $K = G_2 \cup c_x$, $\mathcal{G} = \Gamma$, $e = e_{x-1}$, and $\mathcal{H}' = \Gamma_1$, in order to obtain a planar straight-line realization Γ' of G whose restriction to G_1 is Γ_1 . Further, since Γ_2 is e_x -optimal, it is e_x -smaller than the restriction of Γ' to G_2 ; hence, we can apply Lemma 21 with $H = G_2$, $K = G_1 \cup c_x$, $\mathcal{G} = \Gamma'$, $e = e_x$, and $\mathcal{H}' = \Gamma_2$, in order to obtain a planar straight-line realization Γ'' of G whose restriction to G_1 is Γ_1 and whose restriction to G_2 is Γ_2 ; however, this is one of the four straight-line realizations for which the planarity testing was negative, a contradiction.

It remains show an $O(n)$ -time algorithm that either concludes that G_1 admits no e_{x-1} -outer realization, or determines an e_{x-1} -optimal realization of G_1 . A very similar application of the algorithm allows us to either conclude that G_2 admits no e_x -outer realization or to determine an e_x -optimal realization of G_2 .

For $i = 1, \dots, x-1$, let G_1^i be the subgraph of G_1 composed of the 3-cycles c_1, c_2, \dots, c_i ; note that $G_1^{x-1} = G_1$. A key observation for our algorithm is the following. Assume that an e_{x-1} -outer realization Γ_1 of G_1 exists; let Γ_1^i be the restriction of Γ_1 to G_1^i . Then Γ_1^i is an e_i -outer realization of G_1^i . This is trivial when $i = x-1$; further, when $i < x-1$, if e_i were not incident to the outer face of Γ_1^i , then e_{x-1} could not be incident to the outer face of Γ_1 without violating the planarity of Γ_1 .

Our algorithm works by induction on i in order to either conclude that G_1^i admits no e_i -outer realization (and thus G_1 admits no e_{x-1} -outer realization), or to determine an e_i -optimal realization Γ_1^i of G_1^i . This is trivial when $i = 1$, namely G_1^1 is the 3-cycle c_1 which has a unique planar straight-line realization $\Gamma_1^1 := \mathcal{C}_1$, up to a rigid transformation; then Γ_1^1 is indeed an e_1 -optimal realization.

Assume that we have an e_{i-1} -optimal realization Γ_1^{i-1} of G_1^{i-1} , for some $i \in \{2, \dots, x-1\}$; indeed, if we already concluded that G_1 admits no e_{x-1} -outer realization, there is nothing else to do.

Note that the cycles c_{i-1} and c_i share the edge e_{i-1} ; let v_{i-1} and v_i be the vertices of c_{i-1} and c_i , respectively, not incident to e_{i-1} . Any straight-line realization of G_1^i is of one of two types: it is a *different-side* realization if v_{i-1} and v_i lie on different sides of the line through e_{i-1} , while it is a *same-side* realization if v_{i-1} and v_i lie on the same side of the line through e_{i-1} .

In order to determine whether an e_i -outer realization of G_1^i exists, we combine Γ_1^{i-1} with \mathcal{C}_i in two ways, so to form a different-side realization and a same-side realization. Namely, G_1^{i-1} and c_i share the edge e_{i-1} ;




Fig. 27: The four different ways to combine Γ_1 and Γ_2 with \mathcal{C}_x . In this example, the first realization is not planar, while the other three are.

hence, once Γ_1^{i-1} and \mathcal{C}_i coincide on the representation of e_{i-1} , it still remains to decide whether v_{i-1} and v_i lie on different sides or on the same side of the line through e_{i-1} . This choice leads to two straight-line realizations of G_1^i , which we respectively denote by $\Gamma_1^{i,a}$ and $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$.

We check each of $\Gamma_1^{i,a}$ and $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$ for planarity and discard each realization that is not planar. Further, if $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$ was not discarded, then the triangles \mathcal{C}_{i-1} and \mathcal{C}_i are one nested into the other one (except for the edge e_{i-1} , which is common to both triangles) in such a realization. If \mathcal{C}_i is nested into \mathcal{C}_{i-1} , then we discard $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$, as it is not an e_i -outer realization of G_1^i . We have now three cases:

- If we did not discard $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$, then we set $\Gamma_1^i = \Gamma_1^{i,b}$. Indeed, if we did not discard $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$, then $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$ is a planar straight-line realization of G_1^i in which \mathcal{C}_{i-1} is nested into \mathcal{C}_i ; this implies that all of Γ_1^{i-1} lies inside \mathcal{C}_i , hence $\mathcal{I}_{\Gamma_1^i}$ coincides with the closure of the interior of \mathcal{C}_i . It follows that Γ_1^i is an e_i -optimal realization of G_1^i , given that in any planar straight-line realization of G_1^i the cycle c_i is represented by the triangle \mathcal{C}_i .
- If we discarded $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$ but we did not discard $\Gamma_1^{i,a}$, then we set $\Gamma_1^i = \Gamma_1^{i,a}$. We prove that Γ_1^i is an e_i -optimal realization of G_1^i .

First, we prove that there exists no same-side e_i -outer realization of G_1^i . This is obvious if $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$ was discarded because \mathcal{C}_i is nested into \mathcal{C}_{i-1} , as the same would be true in any same-side realization of G_1^i . Suppose hence that $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$ was discarded because it is not planar and suppose, for a contradiction, that there exists a same-side e_i -outer realization Ψ_1^i of G_1^i . Since Γ_1^{i-1} is e_{i-1} -optimal, it is e_{i-1} -smaller than the restriction of Ψ_1^i to G_1^{i-1} ; hence, we can apply Lemma 21 with $H = G_1^{i-1}$, $K = c_i$, $\mathcal{G} = \Psi_1^i$, $e = e_{i-1}$, and $\mathcal{H}' = \Gamma_1^{i-1}$, in order to obtain a planar straight-line realization $\Gamma_1^{i,*}$ of G whose restriction to G_1^{i-1} is Γ_1^{i-1} . Since Ψ_1^i is a same-side realization of G_1^i , we have that $\Gamma_1^{i,*}$ is also a same-side realization of G_1^i . Hence, $\Gamma_1^{i,*}$ is the same realization as $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$, a contradiction to the fact that $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$ is not planar.

Second, since we did not discard $\Gamma_1^{i,a}$, we have that $\Gamma_1^i = \Gamma_1^{i,a}$ is planar. This, together with the fact that Γ_1^i is a different-side realization, implies that Γ_1^i is an e_i -outer realization. The proof that Γ_1^i is an e_i -optimal realization of G_1^i easily follows by induction. Namely, as proved above, any e_i -outer realization of G_1^i is a different-side realization. Consider any such realization Ψ_1^i and let Ψ_1^{i-1} be the restriction of Ψ_1^i to the vertices and edges of G_1^{i-1} . By induction, we have that Γ_1^{i-1} is e_{i-1} -smaller than Ψ_1^{i-1} , hence Γ_1^i is e_i -smaller than Ψ_1^i , given that the realization \mathcal{C}_i of c_i coincides in Γ_1^i and Ψ_1^i .

- Finally, if we discarded both $\Gamma_1^{i,a}$ and $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$, we conclude that there exists no e_i -outer realization of G_1^i . Namely, the proof that there exists no same-side e_i -outer realization of G_1^i is the same as for the case in which we discarded $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$ but we did not discard $\Gamma_1^{i,a}$. The proof that there exists no different-side e_i -outer realization of G_1^i is also very similar to the proof for a same-side realization. Indeed, that we discarded $\Gamma_1^{i,a}$ was unequivocally due to the fact that it is not planar. Suppose, for a contradiction, that there exists a different-side e_i -outer realization Ψ_1^i of G_1^i . Since Γ_1^{i-1} is e_{i-1} -optimal, it is e_{i-1} -smaller than the restriction of Ψ_1^i to G_1^{i-1} ; hence, we can apply Lemma 21 with $H = G_1^{i-1}$, $K = c_i$, $\mathcal{G} = \Psi_1^i$, $e = e_{i-1}$, and $\mathcal{H}' = \Gamma_1^{i-1}$, in order to obtain a planar straight-line realization $\Gamma_1^{i,*}$ of G whose restriction to G_1^{i-1} is Γ_1^{i-1} . Since Ψ_1^i is a different-side realization of G_1^i , we have that $\Gamma_1^{i,*}$ is also a different-side realization of G_1^i . Hence, $\Gamma_1^{i,*}$ is the same realization as $\Gamma_1^{i,a}$, a contradiction to the fact that $\Gamma_1^{i,a}$ is not planar.

It remains to show how the described algorithm can be implemented to run in $O(n)$ time. Note that a naive implementation of our algorithm would take $O(n^2)$ time. Indeed, for each of the $O(n)$ inductive steps, the realizations $\Gamma_1^{i,a}$ and $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$, together with their plane embeddings $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^{i,a})$ and $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^{i,b})$, can be constructed in $O(1)$ time from Γ_1^{i-1} and its plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^{i-1})$. Further, the test on whether \mathcal{C}_i is nested into \mathcal{C}_{i-1} in $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$ can also be performed in $O(1)$ time. Finally, by Theorem 3, it can be tested in $O(n)$ time whether $\Gamma_1^{i,a}$ and $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$ are planar straight-line realizations of G_1^{i-1} respecting $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^{i,a})$ and $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^{i,b})$, respectively.

In order to achieve $O(n)$ total running time, we do not test planarity at each inductive step. Rather, for $i = 1, \dots, x-1$, we compute a “candidate” straight-line realization Γ_1^i of G_1^i , and we only test for the planarity of the final realization Γ_1^{x-1} . “Candidate” here means e_i -optimal, however only in the case in which Γ_1^i is planar. Indeed, Γ_1^i might not be planar, in which case the candidate straight-line realization Γ_1^i of G_1^i is not required to satisfy any specific geometric constraint.

More formally, for $i = 1, \dots, x - 1$, we construct a straight-line realization Γ_1^i of G_1^i , together with a plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$, satisfying the following invariant: If an e_i -outer realization of G_1^i exists, then Γ_1^i is an e_i -optimal realization of G_1^i and $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$ is the plane embedding of G_1^i corresponding to Γ_1^i . We again remark that, if an e_i -outer realization of G_1^i does not exist, then Γ_1^i is non-planar or the edge e_i is not incident to the outer face of Γ_1^i .

In order to construct Γ_1^i , we maintain:

- the boundary \mathcal{B}_1^i of the convex hull of Γ_1^i (that is, the sequence of vertices along \mathcal{B}_1^i);
- a Boolean value $\beta(e_i)$ such that $\beta(e_i) = \mathbf{True}$ if and only if e_i is an edge of \mathcal{B}_1^i ; and
- a distinguished vertex ξ_i of \mathcal{B}_1^i (this information is only available if $\beta(e_i) = \mathbf{False}$; the meaning of ξ_i will be explained later).

Our algorithm only guarantees the correctness of the above information in the case in which G_1^i admits an e_i -outer realization. For example, if G_1^i does not admit an e_i -outer realization, \mathcal{B}_1^i might not correctly represent the boundary of the convex hull of Γ_1^i .

Before describing our algorithm, we introduce a problem and a known solution for it. Let \mathcal{Z} be a planar straight-line drawing of a path $S = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m)$ and, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, let \mathcal{Z}_i be the restriction of \mathcal{Z} to the subpath $Z_i = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_i)$ of Z . Suppose that the locations of z_1, z_2, \dots, z_m in \mathcal{Z} are unveiled one at a time, in that order. For $i = 1, \dots, m$, when the location of z_i is unveiled, we want to compute the boundary of the convex hull of \mathcal{Z}_i . Melkman [37] presented an algorithm to solve the problem (i.e., to compute the boundaries of the convex hulls of $\mathcal{Z}_1, \mathcal{Z}_2, \dots, \mathcal{Z}_m$) in total $O(m)$ time.

This result allows us to compute the boundaries $\mathcal{B}_1^1, \mathcal{B}_1^2, \dots, \mathcal{B}_1^{x-1}$ of the convex hulls of $\Gamma_1^1, \Gamma_1^2, \dots, \Gamma_1^{x-1}$ in total $O(n)$ time. Indeed, an easy inductive argument proves that G_1^{x-1} contains a path Z spanning all its vertices and such that, for $i = 1, \dots, x - 1$, the vertices of G_1^i induce a subpath Z_i of Z . For $i = 2, \dots, x - 1$, our algorithm constructs Γ_1^i from Γ_1^{i-1} by assigning a position to the vertex v_i of \mathcal{C}_i not incident to e_{i-1} ; once we have done that, the algorithm by Melkman [37] can be employed in order to compute \mathcal{B}_1^i from \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1} (more precisely, we run Melkman's algorithm [37] in parallel with our algorithm and feed it the locations of the vertices of Z in the order our algorithm computes them). Note that, if G_1^i admits an e_i -outer realization, then \mathcal{B}_1^i is correctly computed, otherwise \mathcal{B}_1^i might not correctly represent the boundary of the convex hull of Γ_1^i . We will only sketch what Melkman's algorithm [37] does in order to compute $\mathcal{B}_1^1, \mathcal{B}_1^2, \dots, \mathcal{B}_1^{x-1}$.

The base case takes $O(1)$ time, as G_1^1 has a unique (planar) straight-line realization $\Gamma_1^1 = \mathcal{C}_1$, up to a rigid transformation; further, $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^1)$ is easily computed from Γ_1^1 , and we have $\mathcal{B}_1^1 = \mathcal{C}_1$, $\beta(e_1) = \mathbf{True}$, and $\xi_1 = \mathbf{Null}$. Now assume that, for some $i \in \{2, \dots, x - 1\}$, we have a candidate straight-line realization Γ_1^{i-1} of G_1^{i-1} , together with a plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^{i-1})$, satisfying the invariant, the boundary \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1} of the convex hull of Γ_1^{i-1} , the Boolean value $\beta(e_{i-1})$, and the vertex ξ_{i-1} . We are going to distinguish some cases; common to all the cases is the observation that, if Γ_1^{i-1} is not planar, then it is not important how our algorithm computes Γ_1^i , $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$, \mathcal{B}_1^i , $\beta(e_i)$, and ξ_i , because, by the invariant, G_1^{i-1} admits no e_{i-1} -outer realization and hence G_1^i admits no e_i -outer realization.

Case 1: $\beta(e_{i-1}) = \mathbf{True}$. We check whether Γ_1^{i-1} and \mathcal{C}_i can be combined in order to form a same-side e_i -outer realization of G_1^i (assuming that Γ_1^{i-1} is planar). Since we know \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1} , this check only requires $O(1)$ time. Indeed, once \mathcal{C}_i is embedded in such a way that v_{i-1} and v_i lie on the same side of the line through e_{i-1} , it suffices to compare the slopes of the edges of \mathcal{C}_i different from e_{i-1} with the slopes of the segments of \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1} incident to the end-vertices of e_{i-1} and different from e_{i-1} ; see Fig. 28a.

- *Case 1.1:* If the check is successful, we let Γ_1^i be the resulting straight-line realization of G_1^i ; further, the plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$ can be computed in $O(1)$ time from $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^{i-1})$ by inserting the edges of \mathcal{C}_i incident to v_i next to e_{i-1} in the cyclic order of the edges incident to the end-vertices of e_{i-1} and by letting the outer face of $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$ be bounded by the cycle \mathcal{C}_i . Finally, we let $\mathcal{B}_1^i = \mathcal{C}_i$, $\beta(e_i) = \mathbf{True}$, and $\xi_i = \mathbf{Null}$. Note that, if Γ_1^{i-1} is planar, then Γ_1^i is an e_i -optimal realization of G_1^i (this is the realization which was earlier called $\Gamma_1^{i,b}$).
- *Case 1.2:* If the check is unsuccessful, we let Γ_1^i be the straight-line realization obtained from Γ_1^{i-1} by embedding \mathcal{C}_i in such a way that v_{i-1} and v_i lie on different sides of the line through e_{i-1} . Thus, Γ_1^i can be constructed in $O(1)$ time from Γ_1^{i-1} . The plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$ can also be computed in $O(1)$

time from $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^{i-1})$; indeed, the set of clockwise orders of the edges incident to each vertex in $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$ is computed as in Case 1.1, while the boundary of the outer face of $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$ is computed from the one of $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^{i-1})$ by letting the two edges of c_i incident to v_i replace the edge e_{i-1} . Note that, if Γ_1^{i-1} is planar, then Γ_1^i is an e_i -optimal realization of G_1^i ; this is the realization which was earlier called $\Gamma_1^{i,a}$.




Fig. 28: Embedding \mathcal{C}_i (thick black) together with Γ_1^{i-1} . (a) In order to establish whether Γ_1^{i-1} (whose convex hull is gray) fits inside \mathcal{C}_i , the slopes of the edges of \mathcal{C}_i incident to v_i are compared with the slopes of the segments of \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1} incident to the end-vertices of e_{i-1} and different from e_{i-1} (lines through these segments are dark gray). (b) If \mathcal{C}_i is embedded so that v_{i-1} and v_i lie on different sides of the line through e_{i-1} , then \mathcal{B}_1^i has to be computed; Melkman’s algorithm [37] examines the segments from v_i to the vertices that follow s_{i-1} in counter-clockwise order along \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1} , until it finds a segment (dark gray) from v_i to a vertex s'_{i-1} that keeps the previously encountered segment σ to the right. (c) If e_i lies in the interior of the convex hull of Γ_1^i , except possibly for its end-vertices, then the segments σ and τ of \mathcal{B}_1^i incident to $\xi_i = v_i$ represent the only “way out” of \mathcal{B}_1^i for a planar straight-line realization of G_1^{x-1} ; in particular, in any e_{x-1} -outer realization of G_1^{x-1} , the vertices and edges that are not in G_1^i and that lie inside \mathcal{B}_1^i can only lie in the dark gray regions incident to σ and τ . (d) Illustration for the case in which v_i lies outside the convex hull of Γ_1^{i-1} and ξ_{i-1} is the end-vertex of e_i different from v_i . (e) Illustration for the case in which v_i lies outside the convex hull of Γ_1^{i-1} and ξ_{i-1} is not the end-vertex of e_i different from v_i .

In order to compute \mathcal{B}_1^i from \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1} , Melkman’s algorithm [37] works as follows; refer to Fig. 28b. Let s_{i-1} and t_{i-1} be the end-vertices of e_{i-1} and assume that s_{i-1} immediately precedes t_{i-1} in clockwise order along \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1} . Since v_i is a vertex of \mathcal{B}_1^i , the algorithm needs to find the vertices of \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1} that follow v_i in clockwise and counter-clockwise order along \mathcal{B}_1^i . In order to find the vertex that follows v_i in counter-clockwise order along \mathcal{B}_1^i (the computation of the other vertex is done similarly), the algorithm computes the segments from v_i to the vertices of \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1} , starting from s_{i-1} and proceeding in counter-clockwise order along \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1} . This computation stops when a segment from v_i to a vertex s'_{i-1} of \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1} is considered such that the oriented line that passes first through v_i and then through s'_{i-1} keeps the previously encountered segment σ to the right. When that happens, the end-vertex of σ different from v_i is the vertex that follows v_i in counter-clockwise order along \mathcal{B}_1^i . This computation does not, in general, take $O(1)$ time, however it takes linear time in the number of vertices of \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1} that are not in \mathcal{B}_1^i , hence it takes $O(n)$ time over all the convex hull computations.

Let σ and τ be the segments of \mathcal{B}_1^i incident to v_i . In order to compute $\beta(e_i)$ and ξ_i , we check whether e_i coincides with one of σ and τ . In the positive case, we let $\beta(e_i) = \text{True}$ and $\xi_i = \text{Null}$. In the negative case, we let $\beta(e_i) = \text{False}$ and $\xi_i = v_i$. We are now ready to explain the meaning of the information conveyed in ξ_i ; refer to Fig. 28c. If e_i lies in the interior of the convex hull of Γ_1^i , except possibly for one of its end-vertices, then the segments σ and τ of \mathcal{B}_1^i incident to ξ_i represent the only “way out” of \mathcal{B}_1^i for a planar straight-line realization of G_1^{x-1} . Formally, let j be the smallest index such that $j > i$ and such that v_j lies outside \mathcal{B}_1^i in a planar straight-line realization of G_1^j , if any such an index exists; then (at least) one of the two edges incident to v_j in G_1^j crosses σ or τ . This very same property is exploited in

Melkman’s algorithm [37], and comes from the fact that, by the connectivity of G_1^i , any path that starts at v_i , that does not share any vertex with G_1^i other than v_i , and that first intersects the interior of the convex hull of Γ_1^i and then crosses \mathcal{B}_1^i in a segment different from σ and τ crosses Γ_1^i as well.

Case 2: $\beta(e_{i-1}) = \text{False}$. In this case Γ_1^{i-1} lies on both sides of the line through e_{i-1} , hence Γ_1^{i-1} and \mathcal{C}_i cannot be combined in order to form a same-side e_i -outer realization of G_1^i , even if Γ_1^{i-1} is planar. Thus, as in Case 1.2, we let Γ_1^i be the straight-line realization obtained from Γ_1^{i-1} by embedding \mathcal{C}_i in such a way that v_{i-1} and v_i lie on different sides of the line through e_{i-1} ; this is again the realization which was earlier called $\Gamma_1^{i,a}$. The plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$ is computed in $O(1)$ time from $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^{i-1})$ as in Case 1.2. Then Γ_1^i satisfies the invariant; indeed, in the description of the algorithm, it was proved that, if $\Gamma_1^{i,a}$ is planar, then it is e_i -optimal, otherwise G_1^i admits no e_i -outer realization. Further, Γ_1^i can be constructed in $O(1)$ time from Γ_1^{i-1} . Note that, in this case, it might happen that Γ_1^i is not planar even if Γ_1^{i-1} is planar; however, we do not check the planarity of Γ_1^i at this time.

In order to compute \mathcal{B}_1^i , $\beta(e_i)$, and ξ_i , we exploit the information stored in ξ_{i-1} . As explained in Case 1.2, if Γ_1^{i-1} is planar, the value ξ_{i-1} represents a vertex on the boundary \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1} of the convex hull of Γ_1^{i-1} such that v_i lies outside \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1} only if the (at least one) edge e of c_i incident to v_i and not incident to ξ_{i-1} crosses σ or τ , where σ and τ are the segments incident to ξ_{i-1} in \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1} . Hence, we (as in Melkman’s algorithm [37]) check in $O(1)$ time whether e crosses σ or τ .

- In the positive case, v_i lies outside the convex hull of Γ_1^{i-1} ; then \mathcal{B}_1^i is constructed as in Case 1.2, where the segment between σ and τ that crosses e plays the role of e_{i-1} . If ξ_{i-1} is the end-vertex of e_i different from v_i , as in Fig. 28d, then we set $\beta(e_i) = \text{True}$ and $\xi_i = \text{Null}$ (in this case G_1^i “made it out” of \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1}), otherwise, as in Fig. 28e, we set $\beta(e_i) = \text{False}$ and $\xi_i = v_i$.
- In the negative case, v_i lies inside the convex hull of Γ_1^{i-1} or Γ_1^i is not planar (or both). Hence, we set $\mathcal{B}_1^i = \mathcal{B}_1^{i-1}$, $\beta(e_i) = \text{False}$, and $\xi_i = \xi_{i-1}$.

This concludes the description of the inductive case of our algorithm. Each inductive step takes $O(1)$ time, except for the computation of the boundaries $\mathcal{B}_1^1, \mathcal{B}_1^2, \dots, \mathcal{B}_1^{x-1}$, which however takes total $O(n)$ time as explained above. Hence, the overall running time of the algorithm is in $O(n)$. \square




Fig. 29: The outerplane embedding of an outerpillar. The gray face is the one bounded by c_x . The graphs G_1 and G_2 are enclosed inside fat curves.

Proof of Theorem 11. The proof uses several ideas from the proof of Theorem 10. We hence omit details of arguments that have been already detailed in that proof.

Let $G = (V, E, \lambda)$ be an n -vertex weighted maximal outerpillar (as the one in Fig. 29) and let \mathcal{O} be its outerplane embedding, which can be found in $O(n)$ time [21,38,50]. Since G is an outerpillar, its dual tree is a caterpillar T , whose spine we denote by $P := (p_1, \dots, p_k)$; note that T can be easily recovered from \mathcal{O} in $O(n)$ time. We arbitrarily select two leaves of T , respectively adjacent to p_1 and p_k , and denote them by p_0 and p_{k+1} ; we further denote by \overline{P} the path $(p_0, p_1, \dots, p_k, p_{k+1})$. Each node p_i of \overline{P} corresponds to an internal face of \mathcal{O} ; we denote by c_i the 3-cycle of G bounding such a face. Further, each node p_i in \overline{P} is

adjacent to at most one leaf not in \overline{P} (the satisfaction of this property was the reason to augment P to \overline{P}), which corresponds to an internal face of \mathcal{O} ; we denote by d_i the 3-cycle of G bounding such a face. Each cycle c_i has a unique (planar) straight-line realization (up to a rigid transformation), which we denote by \mathcal{C}_i , and each cycle d_i has a unique (planar) straight-line realization (up to a rigid transformation), which we denote by \mathcal{D}_i . For $i = 0, \dots, k$, let e_i be the edge of G that is dual to the edge (p_i, p_{i+1}) of \overline{P} ; note that e_i is an internal edge of \mathcal{O} . Further, for every index $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that d_i exists, let g_i be the edge shared by c_i and d_i .

Let c^* be a 3-cycle of G whose edges have a sum of the lengths which is maximum among all the 3-cycles of G . Let $x \in \{0, 1, \dots, k+1\}$ be the index such that we have either $c^* = c_x$ or $c^* = d_x$. Let G_1 be the subgraph of G composed of the 3-cycles c_i and of the 3-cycles d_i with $i = 0, \dots, x-1$ (some of the 3-cycles d_i might not exist). Analogously, let G_2 be the subgraph of G composed of the 3-cycles c_i and of the 3-cycles d_i with $i = x+1, \dots, k+1$ (again, some of the 3-cycles d_i might not exist). One of these graphs might be undefined if $x = 0$ or $x = k+1$; however, in the following, we assume that $1 \leq x \leq k$ as the arguments for the cases $x = 0$ and $x = k+1$ are analogous and actually simpler. Note that G_1 and G_2 are maximal outerpillars. Also, we assume that the 3-cycle d_x exists, as the argument for the case in which it does not is simpler.

Assume that a planar straight-line realization Γ of G exists; for $i = 1, 2$, let Γ_i be the restriction of Γ to G_i . If $c^* = c_x$, then c_x does not lie inside any 3-cycle of G in Γ . If $c^* = d_x$, then c_x might lie inside d_x in Γ , however it does not lie inside any other 3-cycle of G in Γ , as otherwise, by planarity, such a 3-cycle would also contain d_x , which is not possible. Therefore, both if $c^* = c_x$ and if $c^* = d_x$, we have that Γ_1 is an e_{x-1} -outer realization of G_1 and that Γ_2 is an e_x -outer realization of G_2 .

We show an $O(n^3)$ -time algorithm that either concludes that G_1 admits no e_{x-1} -outer realization or constructs an e_{x-1} -optimal set \mathcal{R}_1 of e_{x-1} -outer realizations of G_1 , where for each realization Γ_1 in \mathcal{R}_1 the plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1)$ is constructed as well. The same algorithm is then also used in order to either conclude that G_2 admits no e_x -outer realization or to construct an e_x -optimal set \mathcal{R}_2 of e_x -outer realizations of G_2 , where for each realization Γ_2 in \mathcal{R}_2 the plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2)$ is constructed as well.

For $i = 0, 1, \dots, x-1$, let G_1^i be the subgraph of G_1 composed of the 3-cycles c_0, c_1, \dots, c_i and of the 3-cycles d_0, d_1, \dots, d_i (some of these 3-cycles might not exist); note that $G_1^{x-1} = G_1$. As in the proof of Theorem 10, we use the observation that the restriction of any e_{x-1} -outer realization of G_1 to G_1^i is an e_i -outer realization of G_1^i .

Our algorithm works by induction on i in order to either conclude that G_1^i admits no e_i -outer realization (and thus G_1 admits no e_{x-1} -outer realization), or to determine an e_i -optimal set \mathcal{R}_1^i of e_i -outer realizations of G_1^i with $|\mathcal{R}_1^i| \leq i+1$, where for each realization Γ_1^i in \mathcal{R}_1^i the plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$ is constructed as well. This is trivial when $i = 0$, namely G_1^0 is the 3-cycle c_0 which has a unique planar straight-line realization $\Gamma_1^0 := \mathcal{C}_0$, up to a rigid transformation; then $\mathcal{R}_1^0 := \{\Gamma_1^0\}$ is indeed an e_0 -optimal set of e_0 -outer realizations of G_1^0 with $|\mathcal{R}_1^0| \leq 1$ and $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^0)$ is easily computed from Γ_1^0 .

Assume that we have an e_{i-1} -optimal set \mathcal{R}_1^{i-1} of e_{i-1} -outer realizations of G_1^{i-1} with $|\mathcal{R}_1^{i-1}| \leq i$, for some $i \in \{1, \dots, x-1\}$, and we have, for each realization Γ_1^{i-1} in \mathcal{R}_1^{i-1} , the plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^{i-1})$; indeed, if we already concluded that G_1 admits no e_{x-1} -outer realization, there is nothing else to do. We present an algorithm that either concludes that G_1 admits no e_{x-1} -outer realization or constructs the set \mathcal{R}_1^i and, for each realization Γ_1^i in \mathcal{R}_1^i , the plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$. The algorithm consists of three steps.

- **Step 1.** In the first step, we aim for the construction of an e_i -outer realization of G_1^i in which both G_1^{i-1} and d_i lie inside c_i (except for the edges e_{i-1} and g_i , which c_i shares with G_1^{i-1} and d_i , respectively), as the one in Fig. 30a. This is done by checking whether any of the $O(n)$ realizations of G_1^{i-1} in \mathcal{R}_1^{i-1} fits inside \mathcal{C}_i together with \mathcal{D}_i . More precisely, we act as follows.

- (A) We test in $O(1)$ time whether \mathcal{C}_{i-1} lies inside \mathcal{C}_i once they coincide on the representation of e_{i-1} and once their vertices not incident to e_{i-1} lie on the same side of the line through e_{i-1} . If the test is positive, we proceed with the first step of the algorithm, otherwise we conclude that no realization of G_1^{i-1} fits inside \mathcal{C}_i , we terminate the first step of the algorithm and proceed to the second one.
- (B) We test in $O(1)$ time whether \mathcal{D}_i lies inside \mathcal{C}_i once they coincide on the representation of g_i and once their vertices not incident to g_i lie on the same side of the line through g_i ; if d_i does not exist,




Fig. 30: Three e_i -outer realizations of G_1^i . The cycle c_i is represented by a thick line. (a) G_1^{i-1} and d_i lie inside c_i ; (b) G_1^{i-1} lies inside c_i and d_i lies outside c_i ; (c) G_1^{i-1} lies outside c_i .

this test is skipped. If the test is positive, we proceed with the first step of the algorithm, otherwise we conclude that \mathcal{D}_i does not fit inside \mathcal{C}_i , we terminate the first step of the algorithm and proceed to the second one.

- (C) For each realization Γ_1^{i-1} of G_1^{i-1} in \mathcal{R}_1^{i-1} , we construct a straight-line realization Γ_1^i of G_1^i in which G_1^{i-1} is represented by Γ_1^{i-1} and \mathcal{C}_{i-1} and \mathcal{D}_i are embedded inside \mathcal{C}_i . Such a realization can be obtained in $O(1)$ time by augmenting Γ_1^{i-1} with a representation of the edges of c_i and d_i not in G_1^{i-1} . Further, the plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$ can be constructed in $O(1)$ time by inserting the edges incident to v_i next to e_{i-1} in the cyclic order of the edges incident to the end-vertices of e_{i-1} , by then inserting the edges of d_i different from g_i next to g_i in the cyclic order of the edges incident to the end-vertices of g_i , and by letting the outer face of $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$ be bounded by the cycle c_i . We then test in $O(n)$ time, by means of Theorem 3, whether Γ_1^i is a planar straight-line realization of G_1^i respecting $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$.

The total running time of the first step of the algorithm is hence in $O(n^2)$. If (at least) one of these tests succeeds in constructing a realization Γ_1^i , then we complete the induction with $\mathcal{R}_1^i = \{\Gamma_1^i\}$. If none of the tests succeeds, we proceed to the second step of the algorithm.

- **Step 2.** In the second step, we aim for the construction of an e_i -outer realization of G_1^i in which G_1^{i-1} lies inside c_i (except for the edge e_{i-1} , which is shared by G_1^{i-1} and c_i) and d_i lies outside c_i (except for the edge g_i , which is shared by c_i and d_i), as in Fig. 30b. If d_i does not exist, then this step is actually ignored, given that the desired representation of G_1^i would have been already constructed in the first step. As in the first step, we first check whether \mathcal{C}_{i-1} lies inside \mathcal{C}_i once they coincide on the representation of e_{i-1} and once their vertices not incident to e_{i-1} lie on the same side of the line through e_{i-1} . If the test is negative, we conclude that no realization of G_1^{i-1} fits inside \mathcal{C}_i , we terminate the second step of the algorithm and proceed to the third one with $\mathcal{R}_1^i = \emptyset$. If the test is positive, we independently consider each of the $O(n)$ realizations of G_1^{i-1} in \mathcal{R}_1^{i-1} , say Γ_1^{i-1} . We augment Γ_1^{i-1} to a realization Γ_1^i of G_1^i (and compute the plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$ from the plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^{i-1})$) in $O(1)$ time similarly as in the first step, except that \mathcal{D}_i is now embedded outside \mathcal{C}_i and hence the outer face of $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$ is now delimited by the edges of c_i and d_i different from g_i . By means of Theorem 3, we test in $O(n)$ time whether Γ_1^i is a planar straight-line realization of G_1^i respecting $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^i)$. Hence, the total running time of the second step is in $O(n^2)$. If (at least) one of these tests shows that a realization Γ_1^i of G_1^i is planar, we conclude this step by initializing $\mathcal{R}_1^i = \{\Gamma_1^i\}$. If none of the tests succeeds, then we initialize $\mathcal{R}_1^i = \emptyset$. In both cases, we proceed to the third step of the algorithm.
- **Step 3.** In the third step, we aim for the construction of (possibly multiple) e_i -outer realizations of G_1^i in which G_1^{i-1} lies outside c_i (except for the edge e_{i-1} , which is shared by G_1^{i-1} and c_i), as in Fig. 30c. This is done as follows. Preliminarily, we construct a realization of $c_i \cup d_i$ (if d_i exists). In order to do that, we check in $O(1)$ time whether \mathcal{D}_i fits inside \mathcal{C}_i ; in the positive case, we place it inside \mathcal{C}_i , otherwise we place it outside \mathcal{C}_i . We now independently consider each e_{i-1} -outer realization Γ_1^{i-1} of G_1^{i-1} in \mathcal{R}_1^{i-1} and we put it together with the constructed representation of $c_i \cup d_i$ (if d_i does not exist, we just put Γ_1^{i-1} together with \mathcal{C}_i), so that the vertices of c_{i-1} and c_i not incident to e_{i-1} lie on different sides of the

line through e_{i-1} . This can be done in $O(1)$ time, as in the first and second steps, by augmenting Γ_1^{i-1} with a representation of the edges of c_i and d_i not in G_1^{i-1} . The plane embedding of the constructed representation of G_1^i can also be constructed in $O(1)$ time from the plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1^{i-1})$, similarly as in the first and second steps. We now check in $O(n)$ time whether the constructed representation of G_1^i is a planar straight-line realization of G_1^i respecting the constructed plane embedding, by means of Theorem 3; in the positive case, we add it to \mathcal{R}_1^i . Hence, the total running time of the third step is in $O(n^2)$. After the third step, if $\mathcal{R}_1^i = \emptyset$, we conclude that G_1 admits no e_{x-1} -outer realization.

This concludes the description of the algorithm. We now prove its correctness.

First, we prove that $|\mathcal{R}_1^i| \leq i + 1$. This is obvious if the first step succeeded in the construction of a realization of G_1^i , as in that case we have $|\mathcal{R}_1^i| = 1 < i + 1$. Otherwise, at most one realization of G_1^i was added to \mathcal{R}_1^i in the second step; further, during the third step, at most one realization of G_1^i was added to \mathcal{R}_1^i for each realization in \mathcal{R}_1^{i-1} . Since $|\mathcal{R}_1^{i-1}| \leq i$, by the inductive hypothesis, it follows that $|\mathcal{R}_1^i| \leq i + 1$.

Second, we have that each realization in \mathcal{R}_1^i is planar, as ensured by a test performed on it before the insertion into \mathcal{R}_1^i . Further, each realization in \mathcal{R}_1^i is e_i -outer. Namely, if the vertices of c_{i-1} and c_i that are not incident to e_{i-1} lie on the same side of the line through e_{i-1} , we test whether \mathcal{C}_{i-1} lies inside \mathcal{C}_i ; further, if the vertices of d_i and c_i that are not incident to g_i lie on the same side of the line through g_i , we test whether \mathcal{D}_i lies inside \mathcal{C}_i . A realization is added to \mathcal{R}_1^i only if both tests succeed, which ensures that \mathcal{C}_i does not lie inside \mathcal{C}_{i-1} or \mathcal{D}_i in any realization in \mathcal{R}_1^i . A containment of \mathcal{C}_i inside any other 3-cycle of G_1^i would contradict the planarity of the corresponding realization.

Finally, we prove that \mathcal{R}_1^i is e_i -optimal. This can be done very similarly as in the proof of Theorem 10. Namely, consider any e_i -outer realization Ψ_1^i of G_1^i and let Ψ_1^{i-1} be the restriction of Ψ_1^i to G_1^{i-1} . Since \mathcal{R}_1^{i-1} is e_{i-1} -optimal, there exists an e_{i-1} -outer realization Λ_1^{i-1} of G_1^{i-1} in \mathcal{R}_1^{i-1} such that Λ_1^{i-1} is e_{i-1} -smaller than Ψ_1^{i-1} . Hence, we can apply Lemma 21 with $H = G_1^{i-1}$, $K = c_i \cup d_i$ (or $K = c_i$ if d_i does not exist), $\mathcal{G} = \Psi_1^i$, $e = e_{i-1}$, and $\mathcal{H}' = \Lambda_1^{i-1}$, in order to obtain an e_i -outer realization Λ_1^i of G_1^i whose restriction to G_1^{i-1} can be obtained by a rigid transformation of Λ_1^{i-1} and such that \mathcal{C}_{i-1} lies inside \mathcal{C}_i in Λ_1^i if and only if \mathcal{C}_{i-1} lies inside \mathcal{C}_i in Ψ_1^i . It only remains to prove that Λ_1^i , or an e_i -outer realization that is e_i -smaller than Λ_1^i , actually belongs to \mathcal{R}_1^i .

First, if \mathcal{R}_1^i contains a single realization Γ_1^i added during the first step, then the outer face of Γ_1^i is bounded by \mathcal{C}_i ; since the set $\mathcal{I}_{\Lambda_1^i}$ contains at least the closure of the interior of \mathcal{C}_i , we have that Γ_1^i is e_i -smaller than Λ_1^i . We can hence assume that Λ_1^{i-1} lies outside \mathcal{C}_i or that \mathcal{D}_i lies outside \mathcal{C}_i (or both). Indeed, if both Λ_1^{i-1} and \mathcal{D}_i lied inside \mathcal{C}_i , then the first step of the algorithm would have constructed Λ_1^i , and hence \mathcal{R}_1^i would contain a single realization Γ_1^i added during the first step (note that Γ_1^i would not necessarily be the same as Λ_1^i , however the outer faces of both Γ_1^i and Λ_1^i would be delimited by \mathcal{C}_i).

Second, consider the case in which Λ_1^{i-1} lies inside \mathcal{C}_i and \mathcal{D}_i lies outside \mathcal{C}_i in Λ_1^i . This implies that the second step of the algorithm constructs Λ_1^i , and hence \mathcal{R}_1^i contains a realization Γ_1^i added during the second step of the algorithm. The outer face of Γ_1^i is bounded by the edges of \mathcal{C}_i and \mathcal{D}_i different from g_i , same as Λ_1^i , hence Γ_1^i is e_i -smaller than Λ_1^i .

Third, consider the case in which Λ_1^{i-1} lies outside \mathcal{C}_i . If \mathcal{D}_i lies inside \mathcal{C}_i in Λ_1^i , or if \mathcal{D}_i lies outside \mathcal{C}_i in Λ_1^i and does not fit inside \mathcal{C}_i , then the third step of the algorithm constructs Λ_1^i and adds it to \mathcal{R}_1^i . If \mathcal{D}_i lies outside \mathcal{C}_i in Λ_1^i and fits inside \mathcal{C}_i , then the third step of the algorithm constructs a realization Γ_1^i which coincides with Λ_1^i when restricted to $G_1^{i-1} \cup c_i$, but in which \mathcal{D}_i lies inside \mathcal{C}_i . Then we have that Γ_1^i is e_i -smaller than Λ_1^i . This concludes the proof of the e_i -optimality of \mathcal{R}_1^i and of the correctness of the inductive step.

The inductive step is hence performed in $O(n^2)$ time. Since there are $O(n)$ inductive steps, our algorithm takes $O(n^3)$ time in order to either conclude that G_1 admits no e_{x-1} -outer realization or to construct an e_{x-1} -optimal set \mathcal{R}_1 with $|\mathcal{R}_1| \in O(n)$ of e_{x-1} -outer realizations of G_1 together with the plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1)$ of each realization Γ_1 in \mathcal{R}_1 ; the algorithm also takes $O(n^3)$ time in order to either conclude that G_2 admits no e_x -outer realization or to construct an e_x -optimal set \mathcal{R}_2 with $|\mathcal{R}_2| \in O(n)$ of e_x -outer realizations of G_2 together with the plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2)$ of each realization Γ_2 in \mathcal{R}_2 .

As argued above, if G_1 admits no e_{x-1} -outer realization or G_2 admits no e_x -outer realization, then G admits no planar straight-line realization. Assume hence that \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_2 are both non-empty. We indepen-

dently consider each pair (Γ_1, Γ_2) such that $\Gamma_1 \in \mathcal{R}_1$ and $\Gamma_2 \in \mathcal{R}_2$; since $|\mathcal{R}_1|$ and $|\mathcal{R}_2|$ are both in $O(n)$, there are $O(n^2)$ such pairs. We construct eight straight-line realizations of G , each with the corresponding plane embedding, according to the following choices:

- the vertices of c_{x-1} and c_x not incident to e_{x-1} might lie on the same side or on different sides of the line through e_{x-1} ;
- the vertices of c_{x+1} and c_x not incident to e_x might lie on the same side or on different sides of the line through e_x ; and
- the vertices of d_x and c_x not incident to g_x might lie on the same side or on different sides of the line through g_x .

We test in $O(n)$ time whether each of these straight-line realizations is planar and respects the corresponding plane embedding, by means of Theorem 3. Hence, all these tests can be performed in overall $O(n^3)$ time. If (at least) one of these realizations is planar, then it is the desired planar straight-line realization of G . Otherwise, there exists no planar straight-line realization of G ; this can be proved as in the proof of Theorem 10. Namely, if a planar straight-line realization Γ of G exists, then the restriction of Γ to G_1 and the restriction of Γ to G_2 can be replaced by straight-line realizations obtained by rigid transformations of suitable realizations in \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_2 , respectively. By Lemma 21, this results in a planar straight-line realization of G which, by construction, is one of the straight-line realizations for which the planarity testing was negative. This contradiction concludes the proof of the theorem. \square

7 2-Trees with Short Longest Path

In this section, we show that the FEPR problem is polynomial-time solvable for weighted 2-trees whose longest path has bounded length, where the *length* of a path is the number of edges in it. Our algorithm actually runs in polynomial time in a more general case: if the height of the SPQ-tree of the 2-tree is bounded. We start this section by introducing the necessary definitions and notation.

The notion of *SPQ-tree* is a specialization of the well-known notion of *SPQR-tree* [24,31] for *series-parallel graphs* [23,49]. A series-parallel graph is any graph that can be obtained by means of the following recursive construction (see Fig. 31).




Fig. 31: A 2-tree G and its SPQ-tree \mathcal{T} . The gray regions show G_μ and \mathcal{T}_μ , for a node μ of \mathcal{T} . The poles of μ are represented by empty disks in G . The fat edge corresponds to the Q-node that is a child of the root of \mathcal{T} . The height of \mathcal{T} is 8, the one of \mathcal{T}_μ is 4.

- An edge (u, v) is a series-parallel graph with two poles u and v ; its SPQ-tree \mathcal{T} is rooted tree with a single *Q-node*. We say that (u, v) *corresponds* to the Q-node (and vice versa).
- Let G_1, \dots, G_k be series-parallel graphs, where G_i has poles u_i and v_i , for $i = 1, \dots, k$; also, let $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_k$ be their SPQ-trees. The graph obtained by identifying the vertices u_1, \dots, u_k into a single vertex u and the vertices v_1, \dots, v_k into a single vertex v is a series-parallel graph G with poles u and v . The SPQ-tree \mathcal{T} of G is the tree whose root is a *P-node* which is the parent of the roots of $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_k$. We say that G *corresponds* to \mathcal{T} .
- Let G_1, \dots, G_k be series-parallel graphs, where G_i has poles u_i and v_i , for $i = 1, \dots, k$; also, let $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_k$ be their SPQ-trees. The graph obtained by identifying the vertex v_i with the vertex u_{i+1} , for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$, is a series-parallel graph G with poles u_1 and v_k . The SPQ-tree \mathcal{T} of G is the tree whose root is an *S-node* which is the parent of the roots of $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_k$. We say that G *corresponds* to \mathcal{T} .

Every 2-tree G is a series-parallel graph (see, e.g., [13, Chapter 5]) such that:

- (C1) The root of the SPQ-tree \mathcal{T} of G is a P-node.
- (C2) Each P-node has at least two children; one of them is a Q-node and the others are S-nodes.
- (C3) Each S-node has exactly two children, each of which is either a Q-node or a P-node.

Moreover, if e is a prescribed edge of G , then the SPQ-tree of G can be constructed in such a way that the Q-node corresponding to e is a child of the root ρ of the SPQ-tree (that is, e is the edge between the poles of ρ). We will use this property later.

Let G be a 2-tree, \mathcal{T} be the SPQ-tree of G , and μ be a node of \mathcal{T} . We denote by u_μ and v_μ the poles of μ , by \mathcal{T}_μ the subtree of \mathcal{T} rooted at μ , and by G_μ the subgraph of G corresponding to \mathcal{T}_μ . The *height* of \mathcal{T} is the maximum number of edges in any root-to-leaf path in \mathcal{T} . By Conditions (C1)–(C2), the height of \mathcal{T} is even and positive.

We can upper bound the height of an SPQ-tree of a 2-tree G in terms of the length of the longest path of G , as proved in the following lemma.

Lemma 22. *Let G be a 2-tree, let ℓ be the length of the longest path of G , let \mathcal{T} be the SPQ-tree of G , and let h be the height of \mathcal{T} . Then we have $h \leq 2\ell - 2$.*

Proof. We prove the following claim. For every P-node μ in \mathcal{T} , there exists a path P_μ in G_μ that connects the poles u and v of μ and whose length is $\frac{h_\mu}{2} + 1$, where h_μ is the height of \mathcal{T}_μ . The claim implies the lemma by choosing μ to be the root of \mathcal{T} ; this can be done since, by Condition (C1), the root of \mathcal{T} is a P-node.

We prove the claim by induction on h_μ . Recall that h_μ is even and positive. Let ν be a child of μ such that the height of \mathcal{T}_ν is $h_\mu - 1$; by Condition (C2) and since $h_\mu \geq 2$, we have that ν is an S-node with poles u and v . By Condition (C3), we have that ν has two children ν_1 and ν_2 , each of which is either a P-node or a Q-node. Assume, w.l.o.g. up to a relabeling, that u is a pole of ν_1 , that v is a pole of ν_2 , and that w is the pole shared by ν_1 and ν_2 .

In the base case, we have $h_\mu = 2$. Then ν_1 and ν_2 are both Q-nodes, as otherwise the height of \mathcal{T} would be greater than 2. It follows that G contains the path $P_\mu = (u, w, v)$.

In the inductive case, we have $h_\mu > 2$. Assume that the height of \mathcal{T}_{ν_1} is $h_\mu - 2$, as the case in which the height of \mathcal{T}_{ν_2} is $h_\mu - 2$ is analogous. Since $h_\mu > 2$, we have that ν_1 is a P-node. By induction, G_{ν_1} contains a path \mathcal{P}_{ν_1} with length $\frac{h_\mu - 2}{2} + 1$ between u and w . Further, G_{ν_2} contains the edge (w, v) ; this is obvious if ν_2 is a Q-node and comes from Condition (C2) otherwise. The path $\mathcal{P}_{\nu_1} \cup (w, v)$ is the desired path \mathcal{P}_μ with length $\frac{h_\mu}{2} + 1$ between u and v . This completes the induction and hence the proof of the lemma. \square

The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 12. *Let G an n -vertex weighted 2-tree, let e^* be an edge of G with maximum length, let \mathcal{T} be the SPQ-tree of G such that the Q-node corresponding to e^* is a child of the root of \mathcal{T} , and let h^* be the height of \mathcal{T} . There exists an $n^{O(2^{h^*})}$ -time algorithm that tests whether G admits a planar straight-line realization and, in the positive case, constructs such a realization.*

Due to Lemma 22, Theorem 12 implies the following.

Corollary 1. *Let G an n -vertex weighted 2-tree and let ℓ be length of the longest path of G . There exists an $n^{O(4^\ell)}$ -time algorithm that tests whether G admits a planar straight-line realization and, in the positive case, constructs such a realization.*

In the remainder of the section, we prove Theorem 12. Let H be a 2-tree and let (u, v) be an edge of H . A *uv-external* realization of H is a planar straight-line realization of H such that both u and v are incident to the outer face; note that the edge (u, v) is not necessarily incident to the outer face of a *uv-external* realization of H . Given two *uv-external* realizations Γ and Γ' of H , we say that Γ is *uv-equivalent* to Γ' if Γ can be rotated and translated (note that reflections are not allowed) so that the representation of (u, v) coincides with the one in Γ' and so that the boundary of the outer face of Γ coincides with the boundary of the outer face of Γ' . Given a set \mathcal{R} of *uv-external* realizations of H , we say that \mathcal{R} is *uv-complete* if, for every *uv-external* realization Γ' of H , there exists a *uv-external* realization Γ of H in \mathcal{R} such that Γ is *uv-equivalent* to Γ' . Finally, a *uv-complete* set \mathcal{R} of *uv-external* realizations of H is *minimal* if no realization in \mathcal{R} is *uv-equivalent* to a distinct realization in \mathcal{R} .

As a first step of our algorithm, we compute the SPQ-tree \mathcal{T} of G such that the Q-node corresponding to e^* is a child of the root ρ of \mathcal{T} ; this can be done in $O(n)$ time [24,31,49]. One key point of our algorithm is that, for every P-node μ of \mathcal{T} , we only need to look for $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realizations of G_μ (recall that u_μ and v_μ are the poles of μ). This is formalized in the following.

Lemma 23. *Let Γ be any planar straight-line realization of G . For any P-node μ of \mathcal{T} , the restriction Γ_μ of Γ to G_μ is a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization of G_μ .*

Proof. Consider first the case in which $\mu = \rho$. Then Γ_μ coincides with Γ . If Γ were not a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization of G_μ , then e^* would lie inside a 3-cycle c of G in Γ . However, this would contradict the planarity of Γ . Namely, since e^* is an edge with maximum length, the length of e^* would be larger than the one of each side of the triangle representing c in Γ .

Consider now the case in which $\mu \neq \rho$. Suppose, for a contradiction, that (at least) one of u_μ and v_μ , say u_μ , is not incident to the outer face of Γ_μ . Hence, u_μ lies inside a cycle c of G_μ in Γ_μ and in Γ . Furthermore, at most one of u_ρ and v_ρ , say u_ρ , is a vertex of c (if both u_ρ and v_ρ would belong to G_μ , we would have $\mu = \rho$). Since u_ρ and v_ρ are incident to the outer face of Γ , we have that v_ρ lies outside c in Γ . Since G is biconnected, it contains a path that connects u_μ with v_ρ and that does not contain vertices of G_μ other than u_μ . By the Jordan curve theorem, such a path crosses c in Γ , a contradiction. \square

For each P-node μ of \mathcal{T} , we construct an order ν_1, \dots, ν_k of the children of μ as follows. First, we let ν_1 be the only Q-node that is a child of μ ; this node exists by Condition (C2). We denote by $\lambda(\nu_1)$ the length of the edge of G corresponding to such a Q-node. Every other child ν_i of μ is an S-node. Let σ_i and τ_i be the two children of ν_i ; by Condition (C3), each of them is either a Q-node or a P-node. We denote by w_{ν_i} the pole that σ_i and τ_i share (that is, their pole different from u_μ and v_μ); also, we can assume, w.l.o.g. up to a relabeling of σ_i with τ_i , that u_μ is a pole of σ_i and v_μ is a pole of τ_i . Then the edges (u_μ, w_{ν_i}) and (v_μ, w_{ν_i}) belong to G_{ν_i} , as each of σ_i and τ_i is either a Q-node (and then it obviously contains the edge between its poles) or a P-node (and then it contains the edge between its poles by Condition (C2)). Let $\lambda(\nu_i)$ denote the sum of the lengths of the edges (u_μ, w_{ν_i}) and (v_μ, w_{ν_i}) . Then the order of the children of μ is established so that $\lambda(\nu_1) \leq \lambda(\nu_2) \leq \dots \leq \lambda(\nu_k)$. Clearly, such orders can be found for all the P-nodes of \mathcal{T} in overall $O(n \log n)$ time. For a P-node μ of \mathcal{T} with children ν_1, \dots, ν_k and for any $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, we denote by G_μ^i the subgraph of G_μ which is the union of the graphs $G_{\nu_1}, \dots, G_{\nu_i}$. Observe that G_μ^1 is the edge (u_μ, v_μ) , while G_μ^k coincides with G_μ .

Our algorithm either concludes that G admits no planar straight-line realization or constructs the following sets:

- For each Q-node or P-node μ , the algorithm constructs a non-empty minimal $u_\mu v_\mu$ -complete set \mathcal{R}_μ of $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realizations of G_μ . For each realization Γ_μ in \mathcal{R}_μ , the algorithm also constructs the plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\mu)$.




Fig. 32: Construction of the realizations Φ_μ^i and Ψ_μ^i of G_μ^i from the realizations $\Gamma_\mu^{i-1} \in \mathcal{R}_\mu^{i-1}$, $\Gamma_{\sigma_i} \in \mathcal{R}_{\sigma_i}$, and $\Gamma_{\tau_i} \in \mathcal{R}_{\tau_i}$. In this example, $i = 4$; further, Φ_μ^i is planar and Ψ_μ^i is non-planar.

- For each P-node μ with children ν_1, \dots, ν_k and for each $i = 1, \dots, k$, the algorithm constructs a non-empty minimal $u_\mu v_\mu$ -complete set \mathcal{R}_μ^i of $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realizations of G_μ^i . For each realization Γ_μ^i in \mathcal{R}_μ^i , the algorithm also constructs the plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\mu^i)$.

In order to construct such sets, the algorithm bottom-up visits all the Q-nodes and all the P-nodes of \mathcal{T} .

When a Q-node μ is visited, the set \mathcal{R}_μ is defined as $\{\Gamma_\mu\}$, where Γ_μ is the unique (up to rotation and translation) straight-line realization of the edge of G corresponding to μ . Obviously, \mathcal{R}_μ is a minimal $u_\mu v_\mu$ -complete set of $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realizations of G_μ .

Suppose now that a P-node μ of \mathcal{T} with children ν_1, \dots, ν_k is considered. For $i = 2, \dots, k$, since we already visited the children σ_i and τ_i of ν_i , we have the sets \mathcal{R}_{σ_i} and \mathcal{R}_{τ_i} (indeed, if we concluded that G admits no planar straight-line realization, there is nothing else to do). Our algorithm processes the children ν_1, \dots, ν_k of μ in this order. For $i = 1, \dots, k$, after visiting ν_i , the algorithm either concludes that G admits no planar straight-line realization or constructs the set \mathcal{R}_μ^i . In the latter case, for each realization Γ_μ^i in \mathcal{R}_μ^i , the algorithm also constructs the plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\mu^i)$. If the algorithm constructs the set \mathcal{R}_μ^k , then we set $\mathcal{R}_\mu = \mathcal{R}_\mu^k$.

We now describe how the algorithm processes the children ν_1, \dots, ν_k of a P-node μ . The algorithm starts by defining $\mathcal{R}_\mu^1 = \mathcal{R}_{\nu_1}$ (recall that ν_1 is a Q-node). Then, for $i = 2, \dots, k$, it constructs the set \mathcal{R}_μ^i by combining the realizations of G_μ^{i-1} in \mathcal{R}_μ^{i-1} with the realizations of G_{σ_i} in \mathcal{R}_{σ_i} and with the realizations of G_{τ_i} in \mathcal{R}_{τ_i} . This is done as follows.

We initialize $\mathcal{R}_\mu^i = \emptyset$. Then, for every triple of realizations $\Gamma_\mu^{i-1} \in \mathcal{R}_\mu^{i-1}$, $\Gamma_{\sigma_i} \in \mathcal{R}_{\sigma_i}$, and $\Gamma_{\tau_i} \in \mathcal{R}_{\tau_i}$, we construct two straight-line realizations Φ_μ^i and Ψ_μ^i of G_μ^i (and two plane embeddings $\mathcal{E}(\Phi_\mu^i)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\Psi_\mu^i)$ of G_μ^i) as follows. Recall that the poles of σ_i are u_μ and w_{ν_i} , while the ones of τ_i are v_μ and w_{ν_i} . Refer to Figs. 32 and 33.

- First, we initialize both Φ_μ^i and Ψ_μ^i to Γ_μ^{i-1} .
- Second, we place the vertex w_{ν_i} in Φ_μ^i and Ψ_μ^i with the two placements that realize the prescribed lengths of the edges (u_μ, w_{ν_i}) and (v_μ, w_{ν_i}) ; in particular, the placement of w_{ν_i} in Φ_μ^i is such that the clockwise order of the vertices of the cycle $(u_\mu, v_\mu, w_{\nu_i})$ is u_μ, w_{ν_i}, v_μ , while the placement of w_{ν_i} in Ψ_μ^i is such that the clockwise order of the vertices of the cycle $(u_\mu, v_\mu, w_{\nu_i})$ is u_μ, v_μ, w_{ν_i} .
- Third, we insert Γ_{σ_i} in Φ_μ^i so that the representation of the edge (u_μ, w_{ν_i}) in Γ_{σ_i} coincides with the one in Φ_μ^i . We also insert Γ_{τ_i} in Φ_μ^i so that the representation of the edge (v_μ, w_{ν_i}) in Γ_{τ_i} coincides with the one in Φ_μ^i . This concludes the construction of Φ_μ^i . The insertion of Γ_{σ_i} and Γ_{τ_i} in Ψ_μ^i in order to conclude the construction of Ψ_μ^i is done in the same way.
- Finally, we construct a plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Phi_\mu^i)$ as follows:
 - We glue the lists of the edges incident to u_μ in $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\mu^{i-1})$ and $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_{\sigma_i})$, so that, in the counter-clockwise order of the edges incident to u_μ , the edge e_u that enters u_μ when traversing in counter-clockwise




Fig. 33: Construction of the plane embeddings $\mathcal{E}(\Phi_\mu^i)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\Psi_\mu^i)$ of G_μ^i from the plane embeddings $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\mu^{i-1})$, $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_{\sigma_i})$, and $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_{\tau_i})$. The illustration is coherent with the realizations of Fig. 32.

- order the boundary of the outer face of $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\mu^{i-1})$ comes immediately before the edge g_u that enters u_μ when traversing in clockwise order the boundary of the outer face of $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_{\sigma_i})$.
- We glue the lists of the edges incident to v_μ in $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\mu^{i-1})$ and $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_{\tau_i})$, so that, in the clockwise order of the edges incident to v_μ , the edge e_v that enters v_μ when traversing in clockwise order the boundary of the outer face of Γ_μ^{i-1} comes immediately before the edge g_v that enters v_μ when traversing in counter-clockwise order the boundary of the outer face of Γ_{τ_i} .
 - We let the cycle bounding the outer face of $\mathcal{E}(\Phi_\mu^i)$ be composed of the path that goes from v_μ to u_μ in clockwise direction along the outer face of $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\mu^{i-1})$, of the path that goes from u_μ to w_{ν_i} in clockwise direction along the outer face of $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_{\sigma_i})$, and of the path that goes from w_{ν_i} to v_μ in clockwise direction along the outer face of $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_{\tau_i})$.

We remark that $\mathcal{E}(\Phi_\mu^i)$ is not necessarily the plane embedding of Φ_μ^i , in fact Φ_μ^i might even be non-planar. A plane embedding $\mathcal{E}(\Psi_\mu^i)$ is constructed analogously.

The straight-line realizations Φ_μ^i and Ψ_μ^i , together with the plane embeddings $\mathcal{E}(\Phi_\mu^i)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\Psi_\mu^i)$, are hence constructed in $O(n)$ time.

We remark that the plane embeddings $\mathcal{E}(\Phi_\mu^i)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\Psi_\mu^i)$ both place G_{ν_i} “externally” with respect to G_μ^{i-1} . This is a main ingredient for bounding the running time of our algorithm. It is also not a loss of generality, because of the ordering that has been established for the children of μ , as proved in the following lemma.

Lemma 24. *Consider a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization Γ_μ^i of G_μ^i . Then the restriction of Γ_μ^i to G_{ν_i} lies in the outer face of the restriction of Γ_μ^i to G_μ^{i-1} .*

Proof. Suppose, for a contradiction, that the restriction of Γ_μ^i to G_{ν_i} lies inside an internal face f of the restriction of Γ_μ^i to G_μ^{i-1} . In particular, the path $(u_\mu, w_{\nu_i}, v_\mu)$ lies inside f in Γ_μ^i . Since Γ_μ^i is a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization of G_μ^i , both u_μ and v_μ are incident to the outer face of Γ_μ^i , hence it is possible to draw a Jordan arc \mathcal{C}_μ connecting u_μ and v_μ and lying in the outer face of Γ_μ^i , except at its end-points. Now \mathcal{C}_μ and the path $(u_\mu, w_{\nu_i}, v_\mu)$ form a closed curve which contains the edge (u_μ, v_μ) on one side and a graph G_{ν_j} on the other side (as otherwise f would be the outer face of Γ_μ^i), for some $2 \leq j < i$. However, this implies that the path $(u_\mu, w_{\nu_i}, v_\mu)$ lies inside the triangle representing the 3-cycle $(u_\mu, w_{\nu_j}, v_\mu)$ in Γ_μ^i . This contradicts the planarity of Γ_μ^i ; indeed, we have $\ell(\nu_i) > \ell(\nu_j) > \ell(\nu_1)$, hence the length of the path $(u_\mu, w_{\nu_i}, v_\mu)$ is larger than the lengths of the path $(u_\mu, w_{\nu_j}, v_\mu)$ and of the edge (u_μ, v_μ) in Γ_μ^i . \square

We now resume the description of how the algorithm constructs \mathcal{R}_μ^i . By means of Theorem 3, we test in $O(n)$ time whether Φ_μ^i is a planar straight-line realization respecting $\mathcal{E}(\Phi_\mu^i)$. By the construction of $\mathcal{E}(\Phi_\mu^i)$, the test is positive if and only if Φ_μ^i is a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization of G_μ^i . If the test is negative, then we discard Φ_μ^i . Otherwise, for every realization Λ_μ^i in \mathcal{R}_μ^i , we test whether Φ_μ^i is $u_\mu v_\mu$ -equivalent to Λ_μ^i and, if it

is, we discard Φ_μ^i . This can be done in $O(n)$ time by rotating and translating Φ_μ^i so that the representation of the edge (u_μ, v_μ) coincides with the one in Λ_μ^i and by then checking whether the vertices along on the boundary of the outer face of Φ_μ^i have the same coordinates as the vertices along on the boundary of the outer face of Λ_μ^i . If we did not discard Φ_μ^i , then we insert it into \mathcal{R}_μ^i .

We process Ψ_μ^i analogously to Φ_μ^i .

After we have processed every triple of drawings $\Gamma_\mu^{i-1} \in \mathcal{R}_\mu^{i-1}$, $\Gamma_{\sigma_i} \in \mathcal{R}_{\sigma_i}$, and $\Gamma_{\tau_i} \in \mathcal{R}_{\tau_i}$, if the set \mathcal{R}_μ^i is empty, then we report that G admits no planar straight-line realization, otherwise \mathcal{R}_μ^i is a minimal $u_\mu v_\mu$ -complete set of $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realizations of G_μ^i . The correctness of these conclusions is proved in the following lemma.

Lemma 25. *If \mathcal{R}_μ^i is empty, then G admits no planar straight-line realization. Otherwise, \mathcal{R}_μ^i is a minimal $u_\mu v_\mu$ -complete set of $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realizations of G_μ^i .*

Proof. The main ingredient of the proof is the following claim: If G_μ^i admits a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization Λ_μ^i , then \mathcal{R}_μ^i contains a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization that is $u_\mu v_\mu$ -equivalent to Λ_μ^i .

We prove the claim. For a contradiction, suppose that G_μ^i admits a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization Λ_μ^i and that \mathcal{R}_μ^i does not contain any $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization that is $u_\mu v_\mu$ -equivalent to Λ_μ^i . We are going to replace parts of Λ_μ^i with realizations in \mathcal{R}_μ^{i-1} , \mathcal{R}_{σ_i} , and \mathcal{R}_{τ_i} , so to obtain a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization of G_μ^i that is constructed by the algorithm and that should hence have been inserted in \mathcal{R}_μ^i (unless a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -equivalent $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization of G_μ^i is already in \mathcal{R}_μ^i), from which a contradiction follows.

Let Λ_μ^{i-1} , Λ_{σ_i} , and Λ_{τ_i} be the restrictions of Λ_μ^i to G_μ^{i-1} , G_{σ_i} , and G_{τ_i} , respectively. By Lemma 24, we have that Λ_{σ_i} and Λ_{τ_i} lie in the outer face of Λ_μ^{i-1} ; furthermore, the fact that Λ_μ^i is a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization directly implies that Λ_{σ_i} and Λ_μ^{i-1} lie in the outer face of Λ_{τ_i} and that Λ_{τ_i} and Λ_μ^{i-1} lie in the outer face of Λ_{σ_i} .

Since \mathcal{R}_μ^{i-1} is a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -complete set of $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realizations of G_μ^{i-1} , it follows that there exists a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization $\Gamma_\mu^{i-1} \in \mathcal{R}_\mu^{i-1}$ of G_μ^{i-1} that is $u_\mu v_\mu$ -equivalent to Λ_μ^{i-1} . Analogously, there exists a $u_\mu v_{\nu_i}$ -external realization $\Gamma_{\sigma_i} \in \mathcal{R}_{\sigma_i}$ of G_{σ_i} that is $u_\mu w_{\nu_i}$ -equivalent to Λ_{σ_i} and there exists a $v_\mu w_{\nu_i}$ -external realization $\Gamma_{\tau_i} \in \mathcal{R}_{\tau_i}$ of G_{τ_i} that is $v_\mu w_{\nu_i}$ -equivalent to Λ_{τ_i} .

We can now replace Λ_μ^{i-1} with Γ_μ^{i-1} in Λ_μ^i , after rotating and translating Γ_μ^{i-1} so that the representation of the edge (u_μ, v_μ) coincides with the one in Λ_μ^i . Since the boundary of the outer face of Γ_μ^{i-1} coincides with the boundary of the outer face of Λ_μ^{i-1} and since Λ_{σ_i} and Λ_{τ_i} lie in the outer face of Λ_μ^{i-1} , it follows that after the replacement Λ_μ^i remains a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization of G_μ^i (in particular, it remains planar) that is $u_\mu v_\mu$ -equivalent to Λ_μ^i . We can analogously replace Λ_{σ_i} with Γ_{σ_i} and Λ_{τ_i} with Γ_{τ_i} , obtaining a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization of G_μ that is constructed by the algorithm and that is $u_\mu v_\mu$ -equivalent to Λ_μ^i . This implies that \mathcal{R}_μ^i contains a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization that is $u_\mu v_\mu$ -equivalent to Λ_μ^i , a contradiction which proves the claim.

The claim directly implies that, if \mathcal{R}_μ^i is empty, then G_μ^i admits no $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization, hence G_μ admits no $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization (given that G_μ^i is a subgraph of G_μ), and finally that G admits no planar straight-line realization, by Lemma 23.

Suppose now that \mathcal{R}_μ^i is non-empty. We prove that \mathcal{R}_μ^i is a minimal $u_\mu v_\mu$ -complete set of $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realizations of G_μ^i . First, that every realization Γ_μ^i in \mathcal{R}_μ^i is $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external directly descends from the $O(n)$ -time test that is performed by means of Theorem 3 on Γ_μ^i ; indeed, Γ_μ^i is inserted into \mathcal{R}_μ^i only if the test reports that Γ_μ^i is a planar straight-line realization whose plane embedding is the one constructed by the algorithm, in which u_μ and v_μ are incident to the outer face. Second, that \mathcal{R}_μ^i is $u_\mu v_\mu$ -complete is a direct consequence of the claim above. Finally, the minimality of \mathcal{R}_μ^i comes from the fact that a realization is inserted into \mathcal{R}_μ^i only if it is not $u_\mu v_\mu$ -equivalent to any realization already in \mathcal{R}_μ^i . \square

It remains to determine the running time of our algorithm. The main ingredient we are going to use is the following combinatorial lemma.

Lemma 26. *Let μ be a Q-node or a P-node of \mathcal{T} , and let h be the height of \mathcal{T}_μ . We have that $|\mathcal{R}_\mu| \leq n^{\frac{2^h-1}{3}} \cdot 2^{\frac{2^h-1}{3}}$. Furthermore, if μ is a P-node, let ν_1, \dots, ν_k be the children of μ . For $i = 1, \dots, k$, we have that $|\mathcal{R}_\mu^i| \leq n^{\frac{2^h-1}{3}} \cdot 2^{\frac{2^h-1}{3}}$.*

Proof. We prove the following claim. Let $f(k)$ be the function whose domain consists of the even natural numbers, that is recursively defined as follows: $f(k) = 1$ if $k = 0$, and $f(k) = 2n \cdot (f(k-2))^4$ if $k > 0$. Then we claim that $|\mathcal{R}_\mu| \leq f(h)$ and $|\mathcal{R}_\mu^i| \leq f(h)$. The claim implies the lemma, as an easy inductive proof shows that the closed form of $f(k)$ is $f(k) = n^{\frac{2^k-1}{3}} \cdot 2^{\frac{2^k-1}{3}}$.

The claim is proved by induction on h . If $h = 0$, then μ is a Q-node, hence by construction we have that $|\mathcal{R}_\mu| = 1 = f(0)$.

Suppose now that $h > 0$, hence μ is a P-node with children ν_1, \dots, ν_k . First, we have $\mathcal{R}_\mu^1 = 1 < f(h)$. We now prove that $|\mathcal{R}_\mu^i| \leq n^{\frac{2^h-1}{3}} \cdot 2^{\frac{2^h-1}{3}}$, for any $i \in \{2, \dots, k\}$; this suffices to complete the induction, since by construction $\mathcal{R}_\mu = \mathcal{R}_\mu^k$. Consider any realization Γ_μ^i in \mathcal{R}_μ^i . Since Γ_μ^i is a $u_\mu v_\mu$ -external realization of G_μ^i and since $i \geq 2$, it follows that there are exactly two graphs among $G_{\nu_1}, \dots, G_{\nu_i}$ that contain edges incident to the outer face of Γ_μ^i . By Lemma 24, one of these graphs is G_{ν_i} , while the other graph, say G_{ν_j} , might be any graph among $G_{\nu_1}, \dots, G_{\nu_{i-1}}$. When traversing the boundary of the outer face of Γ_μ^i in clockwise direction, the edge e_{ν_i} of G_{ν_i} incident to u_μ might appear right before or right after u_μ . Altogether, there are less than $2n$ possibilities for the choice of the graph G_{ν_j} and for whether e_{ν_i} appears right before or right after u_μ in clockwise order along the boundary of the outer face of Γ_μ^i . For each of these $2n$ possibilities, the interior of Γ_μ^i is determined by the choice of four realizations $\Gamma_{\sigma_i} \in \mathcal{R}_{\sigma_i}$, $\Gamma_{\tau_i} \in \mathcal{R}_{\tau_i}$, $\Gamma_{\sigma_j} \in \mathcal{R}_{\sigma_j}$, and $\Gamma_{\tau_j} \in \mathcal{R}_{\tau_j}$. Indeed, the restriction of Γ_μ^i to G_{σ_i} , G_{τ_i} , G_{σ_j} , and G_{τ_j} is a realization in \mathcal{R}_{σ_i} , \mathcal{R}_{τ_i} , \mathcal{R}_{σ_j} , and \mathcal{R}_{τ_j} , respectively. Since the heights of \mathcal{T}_{σ_i} , \mathcal{T}_{τ_i} , \mathcal{T}_{σ_j} , and \mathcal{T}_{τ_j} are each at most $h-2$, by induction each of \mathcal{R}_{σ_i} , \mathcal{R}_{τ_i} , \mathcal{R}_{σ_j} , and \mathcal{R}_{τ_j} has size smaller than or equal to $f(h-2)$. Hence, the number of possible choices for the realizations $\Gamma_{\sigma_i} \in \mathcal{R}_{\sigma_i}$, $\Gamma_{\tau_i} \in \mathcal{R}_{\tau_i}$, $\Gamma_{\sigma_j} \in \mathcal{R}_{\sigma_j}$, and $\Gamma_{\tau_j} \in \mathcal{R}_{\tau_j}$ is smaller than or equal to $(f(h-2))^4$. Finally, the minimality of \mathcal{R}_μ^i implies that no two realizations in \mathcal{R}_μ^i coincide when restricted to G_{σ_i} , G_{τ_i} , G_{σ_j} , and G_{τ_j} . This proves that the number of realizations in \mathcal{R}_μ^i is smaller than or equal to $2n \cdot (f(h-2))^4$; this concludes the induction and hence the proof of the lemma. \square

We are now ready to determine the running time of our algorithm. Whenever a P-node μ with k children ν_1, \dots, ν_k is visited in the bottom-up traversal of \mathcal{T} , for $i = 1, \dots, k$, the set \mathcal{R}_μ^i is constructed by considering every triple of drawings $\Gamma_\mu^{i-1} \in \mathcal{R}_\mu^{i-1}$, $\Gamma_{\sigma_i} \in \mathcal{R}_{\sigma_i}$, and $\Gamma_{\tau_i} \in \mathcal{R}_{\tau_i}$, where σ_i and τ_i are the children of ν_i . By Lemma 26, the number of such triples is at most $(n^{\frac{2^{h^*}-1}{3}} \cdot 2^{\frac{2^{h^*}-1}{3}})(n^{\frac{2^{(h^*-2)}-1}{3}} \cdot 2^{\frac{2^{(h^*-2)}-1}{3}})^2 = n^{(2^{(h^*-1)}-1)}$. $2^{(2^{(h^*-1)}-1)}$; indeed, the height of \mathcal{T} is h^* , hence the height of \mathcal{T}_μ is smaller than or equal to h^* , and the heights of \mathcal{T}_{σ_i} and \mathcal{T}_{τ_i} are smaller than or equal to $h^* - 2$. For each of such triples, two straight-line realizations Φ_μ^i and Ψ_μ^i are constructed in $O(n)$ time, together with the plane embeddings $\mathcal{E}(\Phi_\mu^i)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\Psi_\mu^i)$. By means of Theorem 3, it is tested in $O(n)$ time whether Φ_μ^i and Ψ_μ^i are planar straight-line realizations with plane embeddings $\mathcal{E}(\Phi_\mu^i)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\Psi_\mu^i)$, respectively. For each realization Λ_μ^i of G_μ^i in \mathcal{R}_μ^i , it is tested in $O(n)$ time whether Φ_μ^i is $u_\mu v_\mu$ -equivalent to Λ_μ^i . By Lemma 26, the set \mathcal{R}_μ^i contains at most $(n^{\frac{2^{h^*}-1}{3}} \cdot 2^{\frac{2^{h^*}-1}{3}})$ realizations of G_μ^i , hence these $O(n)$ -time tests are performed $(n^{(2^{(h^*-1)}-1)} \cdot 2^{(2^{(h^*-1)}-1)})(n^{\frac{2^{h^*}-1}{3}} \cdot 2^{\frac{2^{h^*}-1}{3}}) = (n^{\frac{5 \cdot 2^{h^*}-1-4}{3}} \cdot 2^{\frac{5 \cdot 2^{h^*}-1-4}{3}})$ times, with a $(n^{\frac{5 \cdot 2^{h^*}-1-1}{3}} \cdot 2^{\frac{5 \cdot 2^{h^*}-1-4}{3}})$ running time. Since the number of P-nodes in \mathcal{T} is in $O(n)$, the running time of our algorithm is in $(n^{\frac{5 \cdot 2^{h^*}-1+2}{3}} \cdot 2^{\frac{5 \cdot 2^{h^*}-1-4}{3}}) \in n^{O(2^{h^*})}$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 12.

8 Conclusions and Open Problems

We studied the problem of testing if a 2-tree has a planar straight-line drawing with prescribed edge lengths, both when the number of distinct edge lengths is bounded and when it is unbounded.

In the bounded setting, we proved that the problem is linear-time solvable if the number of prescribed distinct lengths is at most two, while it is NP-hard if this number is four or more. Hence, an intriguing question is to determine the complexity of the problem for weighted graphs with three prescribed distinct lengths.

In the unbounded setting, we showed that the problem is linear-time solvable if the embedding of the input graph is prescribed. Moreover, we studied weighted maximal outerplanar graphs, and we proved that the problem is linear-time solvable if their dual tree is a path, and cubic-time solvable if their dual tree is a caterpillar. We leave open the problem about general maximal outerplanar graphs.

Finally, for the general problem on weighted 2-trees, we described a slice-wise polynomial-time algorithm, parameterized by the length of the longest path. A natural open problem is to determine whether the problem admits an FPT algorithm with respect to the same parameter.

References

1. Abel, Z., Demaine, E.D., Demaine, M.L., Eisenstat, S., Lynch, J., Schardl, T.B.: Who needs crossings? Hardness of plane graph rigidity. In: Fekete, S.P., Lubiw, A. (eds.) 32nd International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG '16). LIPIcs, vol. 51, pp. 3:1–3:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2016). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.SocG.2016.3>
2. Aichholzer, O., Kusters, V., Mulzer, W., Pilz, A., Wettstein, M.: An optimal algorithm for reconstructing point set order types from radial orderings. *Int. J. Comput. Geom. Appl.* **27**(1-2), 57–84 (2017)
3. Alon, N., Feldheim, O.N.: Drawing outerplanar graphs using three edge lengths. *Comput. Geom.* **48**(3), 260–267 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comgeo.2014.10.006>
4. Angelini, P., Da Lozzo, G., Di Bartolomeo, M., Di Battista, G., Hong, S., Patrignani, M., Roselli, V.: Anchored drawings of planar graphs. In: Duncan, C.A., Symvonis, A. (eds.) 22nd International Symposium on Graph Drawing (GD '14). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 8871, pp. 404–415. Springer (2014). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-45803-7_34
5. Angelini, P., Da Lozzo, G., Di Battista, G., Di Donato, V., Kindermann, P., Rote, G., Rutter, I.: Windroe planarity: Embedding graphs with direction-constrained edges. *ACM Trans. Algorithms* **14**(4), 54:1–54:24 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3239561>
6. Aspvall, B., Plass, M.F., Tarjan, R.E.: A linear-time algorithm for testing the truth of certain quantified boolean formulas. *Information Processing Letters* **8**(3), 121–123 (1979). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190\(79\)90002-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190(79)90002-4)
7. Ben-Or, M.: Lower bounds for algebraic computation trees (preliminary report). In: Johnson, D.S., Fagin, R., Fredman, M.L., Harel, D., Karp, R.M., Lynch, N.A., Papadimitriou, C.H., Rivest, R.L., Ruzzo, W.L., Seiferas, J.I. (eds.) 15th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC '83). pp. 80–86. ACM (1983). <https://doi.org/10.1145/800061.808735>
8. de Berg, M., Khosravi, A.: Optimal binary space partitions for segments in the plane. *Int. J. Comput. Geom. Appl.* **22**(3), 187–206 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218195912500045>
9. Berger, B., Kleinberg, J.M., Leighton, F.T.: Reconstructing a three-dimensional model with arbitrary errors. *J. ACM* **46**(2), 212–235 (1999). <https://doi.org/10.1145/301970.301972>
10. Blazej, V., Fiala, J., Liotta, G.: On the edge-length ratio of 2-trees. In: Auber, D., Valtr, P. (eds.) 28th International Symposium on Graph Drawing and Network Visualization (GD '20). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12590, pp. 85–98. Springer (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68766-3_7
11. Borrazzo, M., Frati, F.: On the planar edge-length ratio of planar graphs. *J. Comput. Geom.* **11**(1), 137–155 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.20382/jocg.v11i1a6>
12. Brandes, U., Schlieper, B.: Angle and distance constraints on tree drawings. In: Kaufmann, M., Wagner, D. (eds.) 14th International Symposium on Graph Drawing (GD '06). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 4372, pp. 54–65. Springer (2006). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-70904-6_7
13. Brandstädt, A., Le, V.B., Spinrad, J.P.: Graph Classes: A Survey. SIAM Monographs on Discrete Mathematics and Applications, SIAM (1999)
14. Cabello, S., Demaine, E.D., Rote, G.: Planar embeddings of graphs with specified edge lengths. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications* **11**(1), 259–276 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.7155/jgaa.00145>
15. Capkun, S., Hamdi, M., Hubaux, J.: GPS-free positioning in mobile ad hoc networks. *Clust. Comput.* **5**(2), 157–167 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1013933626682>
16. Chaplick, S., Kindermann, P., Löffler, A., Thiele, F., Wolff, A., Zaft, A., Zink, J.: Recognizing stick graphs with and without length constraints. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.* **24**(4), 657–681 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.7155/jgaa.00524>

17. Chazelle, B.: Triangulating a simple polygon in linear time. *Discret. Comput. Geom.* **6**, 485–524 (1991). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02574703>
18. Connelly, R.: On generic global rigidity. In: Gritzmann, P., Sturmfels, B. (eds.) *Proceedings of a DIMACS Workshop on Applied Geometry And Discrete Mathematics*. DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, vol. 4, pp. 147–156. DIMACS/AMS (1990). <https://doi.org/10.1090/dimacs/004/11>
19. Coullard, C.R., Lubiw, A.: Distance visibility graphs. *Int. J. Comput. Geom. Appl.* **2**(4), 349–362 (1992). <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218195992000202>
20. Da Lozzo, G., Devanny, W.E., Eppstein, D., Johnson, T.: Square-contact representations of partial 2-trees and triconnected simply-nested graphs. In: Okamoto, Y., Tokuyama, T. (eds.) *28th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC '17)*. LIPIcs, vol. 92, pp. 24:1–24:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2017). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ISAAC.2017.24>
21. Deng, T.: On the implementation and refinement of outerplanar graph algorithms. Master's thesis, University of Windsor, Ontario, Canada (2007)
22. Devillers, O., Liotta, G., Preparata, F.P., Tamassia, R.: Checking the convexity of polytopes and the planarity of subdivisions. *Comput. Geom.* **11**(3-4), 187–208 (1998). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-7721\(98\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-7721(98)00039-X)
23. Di Battista, G., Eades, P., Tamassia, R., Tollis, I.G.: *Graph Drawing: Algorithms for the Visualization of Graphs*. Prentice-Hall (1999)
24. Di Battista, G., Tamassia, R.: On-line planarity testing. *SIAM J. Comput.* **25**(5), 956–997 (1996). <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539794280736>
25. Di Battista, G., Tamassia, R., Tollis, I.G.: Constrained visibility representations of graphs. *Inf. Process. Lett.* **41**(1), 1–7 (1992). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190\(92\)90072-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190(92)90072-4)
26. Di Giacomo, E., Didimo, W., Liotta, G.: Radial drawings of graphs: Geometric constraints and trade-offs. *J. Discrete Algorithms* **6**(1), 109–124 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jda.2006.12.007>
27. Di Giacomo, E., Hancl, J., Liotta, G.: 2-colored point-set embeddings of partial 2-trees. In: Uehara, R., Hong, S., Nandy, S.C. (eds.) *15th International Conference and Workshops on Algorithms and Computation (WALCOM '21)*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12635, pp. 247–259. Springer (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68211-8_20
28. Eades, P., Wormald, N.C.: Fixed edge-length graph drawing is NP-hard. *Disc. Appl. Math.* **28**(2), 111–134 (1990). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X\(90\)90110-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-218X(90)90110-X)
29. Geelen, J., Guo, A., McKinnon, D.: Straight line embeddings of cubic planar graphs with integer edge lengths. *J. Graph Theory* **58**(3), 270–274 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgt.20304>
30. Goodrich, M.T., Johnson, T.: Low ply drawings of trees and 2-trees. In: Durocher, S., Kamali, S. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 30th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry (CCCG '18)*. pp. 2–10 (2018). <http://www.cs.umanitoba.ca/%7Eecccg2018/papers/session1A-p1.pdf>
31. Gutwenger, C., Mutzel, P.: A linear time implementation of SPQR-trees. In: Marks, J. (ed.) *8th International Symposium on Graph Drawing (GD '00)*. LNCS, vol. 1984, pp. 77–90 (2000). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44541-2_8
32. Hendrickson, B.: Conditions for unique graph realizations. *SIAM J. Comput.* **21**(1), 65–84 (1992). <https://doi.org/10.1137/0221008>
33. Hendrickson, B.: The molecule problem: Exploiting structure in global optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.* **5**(4), 835–857 (1995). <https://doi.org/10.1137/0805040>
34. Jackson, B., Jordán, T.: Connected rigidity matroids and unique realizations of graphs. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B* **94**(1), 1–29 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jctb.2004.11.002>
35. Lenhart, W., Liotta, G., Mondal, D., Nishat, R.I.: Planar and plane slope number of partial 2-trees. In: Wismath, S.K., Wolff, A. (eds.) *21st International Symposium on Graph Drawing (GD '13)*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 8242, pp. 412–423. Springer (2013). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-03841-4_36
36. Lubiw, A., Miltzow, T., Mondal, D.: The complexity of drawing a graph in a polygonal region. In: Biedl, T.C., Kerren, A. (eds.) *26th International Symposium on Graph Drawing and Network Visualization (GD '18)*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 11282, pp. 387–401. Springer (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-04414-5_28
37. Melkman, A.A.: On-line construction of the convex hull of a simple polyline. *Inf. Process. Lett.* **25**(1), 11–12 (1987). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190\(87\)90086-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190(87)90086-X)
38. Mitchell, S.L.: Linear algorithms to recognize outerplanar and maximal outerplanar graphs. *Inf. Process. Lett.* **9**(5), 229–232 (1979). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190\(79\)90075-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190(79)90075-9)
39. Moran, S., Wolfstahl, Y.: One-page book embedding under vertex-neighborhood constraints. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **3**(3), 376–390 (1990). <https://doi.org/10.1137/0403034>

40. Priyantha, N.B., Chakraborty, A., Balakrishnan, H.: The cricket location-support system. In: Pickholtz, R.L., Das, S.K., Cáceres, R., Garcia-Luna-Aceves, J.J. (eds.) 6th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking (MOBICOM '00). pp. 32–43. ACM (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1145/345910.345917>
41. Rengarajan, S., Madhavan, C.E.V.: Stack and queue number of 2-trees. In: Du, D., Li, M. (eds.) First Annual International Conference on Computing and Combinatorics (COCOON '95). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 959, pp. 203–212. Springer (1995). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0030834>
42. Rosenstiehl, P., Tarjan, R.E.: Rectilinear planar layouts and bipolar orientations of planar graphs. *Discret. Comput. Geom.* **1**, 343–353 (1986). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02187706>
43. Savarese, C., Rabaey, J., Beutel, J.: Location in distributed ad-hoc wireless sensor networks. In: 2001 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing. Proceedings. vol. 4, pp. 2037–2040 (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP.2001.940391>
44. Saxe, J.: Embeddability of Weighted Graphs in K-space is Strongly NP-hard. CMU-CS-80-102, Carnegie-Mellon University, Department of Computer Science (1980), <https://books.google.it/books?id=vClAGwAACAAJ>
45. Schaefer, M.: Realizability of graphs and linkages. In: Pach, J. (ed.) *Thirty Essays on Geometric Graph Theory*, pp. 461–482. Springer New York, New York, NY (2013). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-0110-0_24
46. Silveira, R.I., Speckmann, B., Verbeek, K.: Non-crossing paths with geographic constraints. *Discret. Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.* **21**(3) (2019). <https://doi.org/10.23638/DMTCS-21-3-15>
47. Syslo, M.M.: Characterizations of outerplanar graphs. *Discret. Math.* **26**(1), 47–53 (1979). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X\(79\)90060-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X(79)90060-8)
48. Tamassia, R.: Constraints in graph drawing algorithms. *Constraints An Int. J.* **3**(1), 87–120 (1998). <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009760732249>
49. Valdes, J., Tarjan, R.E., Lawler, E.L.: The recognition of series parallel digraphs. *SIAM J. Comput.* **11**(2), 298–313 (1982)
50. Wieggers, M.: Recognizing outerplanar graphs in linear time. In: Tinhofer, G., Schmidt, G. (eds.) *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (WG '86)*. LNCS, vol. 246, pp. 165–176. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (1987). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-17218-1_57
51. Yemini, Y.: Some theoretical aspects of position-location problems. In: 20th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS '79). pp. 1–8. IEEE Computer Society (1979). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1979.39>