

The Parametrized Complexity of the Segment Number

Sabine Cornelsen  


University of Konstanz, Germany

Giordano Da Lozzo 

Roma Tre University, Italy

Luca Grilli 

Università degli Studi di Perugia, Italy

Siddharth Gupta 

BITS Pilani, Goa Campus, India

Jan Kratochvíl 

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

Alexander Wolff 

Universität Würzburg, Germany

Abstract

Given a straight-line drawing of a graph, a *segment* is a maximal set of edges that form a line segment. Given a planar graph G , the *segment number* of G is the minimum number of segments that can be achieved by any planar straight-line drawing of G . The *line cover number* of G is the minimum number of lines that support all the edges of a planar straight-line drawing of G . Computing the segment number or the line cover number of a planar graph is $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete and, thus, NP-hard.

We study the problem of computing the segment number from the perspective of parameterized complexity. We show that this problem is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to each of the following parameters: the vertex cover number, the segment number, and the line cover number. We also consider colored versions of the segment and the line cover number.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation \rightarrow Design and analysis of algorithms; Theory of computation \rightarrow Fixed parameter tractability; Human-centered computing \rightarrow Graph drawings

Keywords and phrases segment number, line cover number, vertex cover number, parameterized complexity, visual complexity

Related Version A preliminary version of this paper appeared at GD 2023 [9].

Funding *Giordano Da Lozzo*: Supported, in part, by MUR of Italy (PRIN Project no. 2022ME9Z78 – NextGRAAL and PRIN Project no. 2022TS4Y3N – EXPAND).

Luca Grilli: Supported, in part, by the Dipartimento di Ingegneria, Università degli Studi di Perugia through grant RICBA21LG.


Siddharth Gupta: Supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) through grant no. EP/V007793/1.

Jan Kratochvíl: Supported by the Czech Science Foundation through grant GAČR 23-04949X.

Acknowledgements We thank the organizers of the Bertinoro Workshop on Graph Drawing 2023 where this research was initiated.

1 Introduction

A *segment* in a straight-line drawing of a graph is a maximal set of edges that together form a line segment. The *segment number* $\text{seg}(G)$ of a planar graph G is the minimum number of segments in any planar straight-line drawing of G [10]. The *line cover number* $\text{line}(G)$ of



■ **Figure 1** The dodecahedron graph has 30 edges, segment number 13, line cover number 10, arc number 10, and circle cover number 5 [20].

a planar graph G is the minimum number of lines that support all the edges of a planar straight-line drawing of G [6]. Clearly, $\text{line}(G) \leq \text{seg}(G)$ for any graph G [6]. As a side note, we show that $\text{seg}(G) \leq \text{line}^2(G)$ for any connected graph G . For circular-arc drawings of planar graphs, the *arc number* [28] and *circle cover number* [20] are defined analogously as the segment number and the line cover number, respectively, for straight-line drawings. For an example, see Figure 1. All these numbers have been considered as meaningful measures of the visual complexity of a drawing of a graph; in particular, for the segment number, a user study has been conducted by Kindermann et al. [19].

In general, it is $\exists\mathbb{R}$ -complete [22] (and hence NP-hard) to compute the segment number of a planar graph. (The complexity class $\exists\mathbb{R}$ was introduced by Schaefer [27].) The segment number can, however, be computed efficiently for trees [10], series-parallel graphs of degree at most three [26], subdivisions of outerplanar paths [1], 3-connected cubic planar graphs [10, 16], and cacti [14]. Upper and lower bounds for the segment number of various graph classes are known, such as outerplanar graphs, 2-trees, planar 3-trees, 3-connected plane graphs [10], (4-connected) triangulations [11], and triconnected planar 4-regular graphs [14]. Some of the lower and upper bounds are so close that they yield constant-factor approximations, e.g., for outerplanar paths, maximal outerplanar graphs, 2-trees, and planar 3-trees [14]. Segment number and arc number have also been investigated under the restriction that vertices must be placed on a polynomial-size grid [28, 18, 15]. Also in the setting that a planar graph G comes with a planar embedding (that is, for each face, the cyclic ordering of the edges around it is given and the outer face is fixed), it is NP-hard to compute the segment number of G with respect to the given embedding [12].

This paper focuses on the parametrized complexity of computing the segment number of a graph. A decision problem with input x and parameter $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ is *fixed-parameter tractable (FPT)* if it can be solved by an algorithm with run time in $O(f(k) \cdot |x|^c)$ where f is a computable function, $|x|$ is the size of the input x and c is a constant. Given a planar graph G and a parameter $k > 0$, the SEGMENT NUMBER problem is to decide whether $\text{seg}(G) \leq k$. This is the *natural parameter* for the problem. By considering additional parameters, we get a more fine-grained picture of the complexity of the problem.

Chaplick et al. [7] showed that computing the line cover number of a planar graph is in FPT with respect to its natural parameter. They observed that for a given graph G and an integer k , the statement $\text{line}(G) \leq k$ can be expressed by a first-order formula about the reals. This observation shows that the problem of deciding whether or not $\text{line}(G) \leq k$ lies in $\exists\mathbb{R}$: it reduces in polynomial time to the decision problem for the existential theory of the reals. The algorithm of Chaplick et al. crucially uses the exponential-time decision procedure for the existential theory of the reals by Renegar [23, 24, 25] (see Section 2). Unfortunately, this procedure does *not* yield a geometric realization. Chaplick et al. even showed that constructing a drawing of a given planar graph that is optimal with respect to

the line cover number can be unfeasible since there is a planar graph G^* [7, Fig. 3b] such that every optimal drawing of G^* requires irrational coordinates. They argue that any optimal drawing of G^* contains the Perles configuration. It is known that every realization of the Perles configuration contains a point with an irrational coordinate [3, page 23]. Moreover, any optimal drawing of G^* admits a cover with ten lines, and each of these lines contains a *single* line segment of the drawing. In other words, every drawing of G^* that is optimal with respect to the line cover number is also optimal with respect to the segment number.

Our results We show that computing the segment number of a graph is FPT with respect to each of the following parameters: the natural parameter, the line cover number (both in Section 5), and the *vertex cover number* (in Section 4). Recall that the vertex cover number is the minimum number of vertices that have to be removed such that the remaining graph is an independent set. In the parametrized complexity community, the vertex cover number is considered a rather weak graph parameter, but for (geometric) graph drawing problems, FPT results can be challenging to obtain even with respect to the vertex cover number [4, 5, 2].

We remark that our algorithms use Renegar’s decision procedure as a subroutine; hence, when we compute the segment number k of a planar graph G , we do *not* get a straight-line drawing of G that consists of k line segments. Recall, however, that even *specifying* such a drawing is difficult for some graphs such as the above-mentioned graph G^* , which has a point with irrational coordinates in any drawing that is optimal with respect to the segment number.

Motivated by list coloring, we also consider colored versions of the segment and line cover number problems. As a warm up, we provide efficient algorithms for computing the segment number of *banana trees* and *banana cycles*, that is, graphs that can be obtained from a tree or a cycle, respectively, by replacing each edge by a set of paths of length two; see Section 3.

2 Preliminaries

In a straight-line drawing of a graph, two incident edges are *aligned* if they are on the same segment. Since the number of segments equals the number of edges minus the number of pairs of aligned edges, we get the following.

► **Lemma 1.** *A planar straight-line drawing has the minimum number of segments if and only if it has the maximum number of pairs of aligned edges.*


An *existential first-order formula about the reals* is a formula of the form $\exists x_1 \dots \exists x_m \phi(x_1, \dots, x_m)$, where ϕ consists of Boolean combinations of order and equality relations between polynomials with rational coefficients over the variables x_1, \dots, x_m . Renegar’s result on the existential theory of the reals can be summarized as follows.

► **Theorem 2** (Renegar [23, 24, 25]). *Given any existential sentence Φ about the reals, one can decide whether Φ is true or false in time*

$$(L \log L \log \log L) \cdot (PD)^{O(N)},$$

where N is the number of variables in Φ , P is the number of polynomials in Φ , D is the maximum total degree over the polynomials in Φ , and L is the maximum length of the binary representation over the coefficients of the polynomials in Φ .

The proof of the next lemma follows the approach by Chaplick et al. [7, Lemma 2.2].



■ **Figure 2** Banana graphs

► **Lemma 3.** *Given an n -vertex planar graph G and an integer $k \leq 3n - 6$, there exists a first-order formula Φ about the reals that involves $O(n^2)$ polynomials in $O(n)$ variables (each of constant total degree and with integer coefficients of constant absolute value) such that Φ is satisfiable if and only if $\text{seg}(G) \leq k$.*

Proof. Note that we can return true immediately if $k > 3n - 6$. Otherwise, the formula Φ needs to model the fact that there are k pairs of points, determining a set \mathcal{L} of k lines, and that there are n distinct points representing the vertices of G such that the segments corresponding to the edges of G lie on the lines in \mathcal{L} and do not overlap or cross each other or leave gaps on the lines. For details on how to encode this, see [7, Lemma 2.2]. ◀

Lemma 3 and Theorem 2 immediately imply the following.

► **Corollary 4.** *Given an n -vertex planar graph G and an integer k , there exists a $2^{O(n)}$ -time algorithm to decide whether $\text{seg}(G) \leq k$.*

In the remainder of this paper, for a graph G , we write $V(G)$ for the vertex set of G and $E(G)$ for the edge set of G .


3 The Segment Number of Banana Trees and Cycles

We first consider some introductory examples. A *banana* is the union of paths that share only their start- and endpoints [29]. In this paper, we additionally insist that all paths have length 2. We say that a banana is a *k -banana* if it consists of k paths (of length 2). We call the joint endpoints of the paths *covering vertices* and the vertices in the interior of the paths *independent vertices*. *Banana graphs*, i.e., graphs in which some edges are replaced by bananas will play an important role in Section 4 when we consider the parameter vertex cover.

► **Lemma 5** ([10]). *A k -banana has segment number $\lceil 3k/2 \rceil$.*

Proof. A k -banana has $2k$ edges. There is a drawing in which $\lceil k/2 \rceil$ pairs of edges are aligned; see Figure 2a. This is optimum: At most one path of length two can be aligned at the independent vertex. If a pair of edges is aligned at one covering vertex then no pair can be aligned at the other covering vertex. ◀

Given an integer $\ell > 0$, a *banana path of length ℓ* is a graph that is constructed from a path $\langle v_0, \dots, v_\ell \rangle$ of length ℓ by replacing, for $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, edge $\{v_{i-1}, v_i\}$ of the path by a k_i -banana, called banana i , for some value $k_i > 0$. We say that k_i is the *multiplicity* of edge $\{v_{i-1}, v_i\}$; see Figure 2b. *Banana trees* and *banana cycles* are defined analogously; see Figure 3.



(a) odd length cycle

(b) even length cycle

■ **Figure 3** Segment minimum drawings of banana cycles.

► **Theorem 6.** *The segment number of a banana path of length ℓ can be computed in $O(\ell)$ time and can be expressed explicitly as a function of the multiplicities.*

Proof. Let B be a banana path of length ℓ with multiplicities k_1, \dots, k_ℓ . In each banana, align two edges at an independent vertex. At each inner covering vertex v_i with $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell - 1\}$, align $a_i = \min\{k_i, k_{i+1}\}$ edges from bananas i and $(i + 1)$. In particular, we align the edges from incident bananas that were aligned at their respective independent vertex. Further, let $a_0 = a_\ell = 1$. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, let $s_i = \max\{k_i - a_{i-1}, k_i - a_i\}$. Align $\lfloor s_i/2 \rfloor$ pairs of edges of banana i at covering vertex v_{i-1} or v_i , based on where the maximum is assumed. See Figure 2b. Note that setting $a_0 = a_\ell = 1$ takes into account that one edge is already aligned at an independent vertex. Therefore, it cannot be aligned at a covering vertex at the same time. It is not possible to align more pairs of edges. Thus, the segment number is $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (2k_i - 1 - a_i - \lfloor s_i/2 \rfloor)$. ◀


Observe that the strategy of locally optimal alignments would no longer work for simple cycles. E.g., assume each edge in a simple cycle was replaced by a 1-banana. Then locally, all pairs of incident edges should be aligned, both at vertices of the simple cycle and at the independent vertices. But this is not realizable geometrically. Instead the segment number would be 3. Some examples of segment-minimum drawings of cycles of 4-bananas are shown in Figure 3.

► **Theorem 7.** *The segment number of*

1. *a banana tree and*
2. *a banana cycle of length at least five where each banana contains at least two independent vertices*

can be computed in time linear in the number of covering vertices.

Proof. Banana tree: Let G be a banana tree constructed from a tree T . For an edge $e = \{u, v\}$ of T , let $k_{uv} = k_{vu}$ be the multiplicity of e and let E_{uv} be the set of edges incident to v that are contained in the k_{uv} -banana inserted for e . For each banana, align the two edges incident to one independent vertex. For each leaf w of T , align the remaining edges of the respective banana – up to at most two – at w . Let v be an inner vertex of T , and let v_1, \dots, v_ℓ be the neighbors of v in T . Align as many pairs of edges from different bananas at v . These are all (except possibly one) edges if there is no $j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ such that $k_{vv_j} > \sum_{i \neq j} k_{vv_i}$. If there is a k_{vv_j} -banana that is *large* at v , i.e., if $k_{vv_j} > \sum_{i \neq j} k_{vv_i}$ for some j then align some



■ **Figure 4** How to align the edges at an inner vertex v of a banana tree.

edges inside the respective k_{vv_j} -banana at v – or at v_j if the k_{vv_j} -banana is also large at v_j and the alignment at this end would be more beneficial. More precisely: let u_1, \dots, u_k be the neighbors of v_j in T different from v . Then align $\lfloor (k_{vv_j} - \sum_{i \neq j} k_{vv_i})/2 \rfloor$ pairs of edges within $E_{v_j v}$ at v or $\lfloor (k_{vv_j} - \sum_{i=1}^k k_{v_j u_i})/2 \rfloor$ pairs of edges within E_{vv_j} at v_j , depending on which number is larger. Observe that at any vertex this condition always holds for at most one banana, so there are no conflicts. Locally, this yields an optimal assignment.

The respective alignment can be realized geometrically: We root T at a degree one vertex r . All but at most two edges incident to r must be aligned at r and two edges incident to one independent vertex incident to r must also be aligned. This can be realized as in Figure 2a. In general, we have now the following situation, we have drawn the bananas contained in a subtree T' of T . All vertices of T' that are incident to vertices not yet in T' are leaves of T' . Let v be such a leaf of T' and let u be the ancestor of v in T' . Let $A \subseteq E_{uv}$ be the set of edges that should be aligned with edges in other bananas and let $B \subseteq E_{uv}$ be the edges that are aligned with each other. We maintain the property that the maximum angle between two edges of A is less than π . Thus, if $B \neq \emptyset$ then B encloses A . See Figure 4a. Moreover, for each leaf v of T' , we maintain disjoint circles C_v around v that contain or intersect at most edges from $E_{uv} \cup E_{vu}$. We now insert the subtree rooted at v into these circles C_v maintaining the alignment requirements, the disjoint circles and the above mentioned drawing requirements. Observe that if $B = \emptyset$ then there might be a different large banana at v (the red banana in Figure 4b). Since the maximum angle at v between two edges in A is less than π it follows that we can always fit this large banana.

Banana cycle: Let G be a banana cycle of length at least five with the property that each banana contains at least two independent vertices. Let H be a maximal subgraph of G such that H is a regular banana cycle, i.e., such that each banana contains the same number of independent vertices. In Figure 3b this is the subgraph induced by the black, gray, blue, and lightblue edges. Depending on whether the length of the cycle is odd or even, draw H as indicated in Figure 3 for banana cycles of length 5 or 6 starting with the one or two cycles, respectively, containing pairs of edges aligned at independent vertices (black and gray). Removing the edges of H from G yields a union of banana paths. We align edges according to the rules for banana paths without aligning edges at independent vertices (edges in different shades of green). ◀

4 Parameter: Vertex Cover Number

In this section, we consider the following parametrized problem.

SEGMENT NUMBER BY VERTEX COVER NUMBER

Input: A simple planar graph G , an integer s .

Parameter: Vertex cover number k of G .

Question: Is the segment number of G at most s ?


Let G be a simple planar graph, and let $V' \subset V(G)$ be a vertex cover of G with k vertices. In order to compute the segment number of G , we first compute a subgraph of G whose size is in $O(2^k)$. We vary over all possible alignments of this subgraph and check whether they are geometrically realizable. We finally use an integer linear program (ILP) in order to reinsert the missing parts from G . In the end, we take the best among the thus computed solutions. The details are as follows.

Dividing $V \setminus V'$ into equivalence classes Two vertices of $v \in V(G) \setminus V'$ are *equivalent* if and only if they are adjacent to the same set of vertices in V' . We say that an equivalence class C is a *j -class* if each vertex $v \in C$ is adjacent to exactly j vertices in V' . Observe that the j -classes contain at most two vertices if $j > 2$. Otherwise G would contain a $K_{3,3}$, contradicting that G is planar. Thus, the number of vertices in j -classes, $j > 2$ is bounded by $2 \cdot \sum_{j=3}^k \binom{k}{j} \in O(2^k)$.

Reducing the size of the graph Let G_1 be the graph obtained from G by removing all vertices contained in 1-classes. Consider a planar embedding of G_1 . Let C be a 2-class and let $v, w \in V'$ be adjacent to all vertices in C . Observe that the edges between v and C do not have to be consecutive in the cyclic order around v (and similarly for w). A *contiguous 2-class* is a maximal subset of C such that the incident edges are consecutive around both v and w . Note that two contiguous 2-classes are separated by the edge $\{v, w\}$ or by at least a vertex-cover vertex. Thus, a 2-class consists of at most k contiguous 2-classes. Now, for each 2-class C , we remove all but $\min(|C|, k)$ vertices from C . Let the resulting graph be G_2 . Observe that the vertices of G_2 are the vertex cover vertices, the vertices of all j -classes, $j > 2$, and at most k vertices from each 2-class. Thus, the number of vertices of G_2 is bounded by $k + 2 \cdot \sum_{j=3}^k \binom{k}{j} + k \cdot \binom{k}{2} \in O(2^k)$.

Alignment within 2-classes For each 2-class C , let e_C be the edge connecting the two vertex cover vertices adjacent to the vertices in C . We vary over all subsets \mathcal{C} of 2-classes C for which e_C is not an edge of G_2 . There are at most 2^{3k} such subsets: Observe that the planar graph induced by V' and one vertex from each 2-class is a subdivision of a graph with vertex set V' and edge set $\{e_C : C \text{ 2-class}\}$, which implies that the number of 2-classes is at most $3k - 6$. For each $C \in \mathcal{C}$, we add e_C to G_2 . These edges represent a pair of aligned edges at an independent vertex. Let the resulting graph be $G_2(\mathcal{C})$.

Varying over all planar embeddings \mathcal{E} of $G_2(\mathcal{C})$ For each 2-class C , we replace each contiguous 2-class in \mathcal{E} by four vertices. The resulting four 2-paths represent the boundaries of two consecutive contiguous 2-classes; each of which shall be drawn in a non-convex way, i.e., such that the segment between the two incident vertex cover vertices does not lie in its



■ **Figure 5** We vary over all pairings π of edges and boomerangs around each vertex. (a) The dashed edges are inserted into $G_2(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E})$ in order to represent alignment requirements with boomerangs. If the alignment requirements of the thus constructed graph $G_2(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, \pi)$ can be geometrically realized, we use an ILP to distribute the remaining edges. (b) How to geometrically insert the 2-classes into a boomerang.

interior. We call these non-convex quadrilaterals *boomerangs*. Let the thus constructed plane graph be $G_2(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E})$.


The reason why we represent each contiguous 2-class by two non-convex quadrilaterals instead of one arbitrary quadrilateral will become clear when we reinsert the 2-classes into the boomerangs; see also Figure 5b: Let $u \in \mathcal{C}$, let v and w be the two vertex cover vertices incident to u and assume that we have opted to draw u into boomerang b . Then we need to ensure that the edges $e_v = \{v, u\}$ and $e_w = \{w, u\}$ meet inside b when we draw e_v starting at v and e_w starting at w independently of each other and with arbitrary slopes.

Alignment Requirements We vary over all possible “pairings” π between edges and/or boomerangs incident to a common vertex v that respect the embedding \mathcal{E} . If we require that two edges are aligned, that an edge should be aligned with an edge inside a boomerang, or that two edges inside different boomerangs can be aligned, we say that the respective edges and boomerangs are *paired*. E.g., Figure 5a illustrates the following pairing around a vertex v : the yellow boomerang is paired with the blue and the red boomerang as well as with the edge $\{v, v_9\}$. The red and the green boomerangs are also paired. Edges $\{v, v_{10}\}$ and $\{v, v_3\}$ are paired. Edge $\{v_6, v\}$ is not paired with any other edge.

In order to handle pairings within boomerangs, we insert further edges into $G_2(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E})$. See the dashed edges in Figure 5a. Let v be a vertex cover vertex. Let v_1, \dots, v_k be the neighbors of v in this order around v . Assume that v_1 and v_2 are two independent vertices representing the border of a boomerang b . Assume that we would like to align the edges around v such that $\{v, v_i\}, \dots, \{v, v_j\}$ should get aligned with some edges in b if any. Then we add up to $j - i + 1$ edges incident to v inside the region representing b and require them to be aligned with the respective edges among $\{v, v_i\}, \dots, \{v, v_j\}$ at v .

E.g., when we consider the yellow boomerang b in Figure 5a then $i = 5, j = 9$. Since we require the red boomerang to be partially paired with b (we also want it to be paired with the green one), we only add a counterpart for one of the boundary edges, $\{v, v_5\}$, inside b . The blue boomerang should be exclusively paired with b , so we add counterparts for both boundary edges, $\{v, v_7\}$ and $\{v, v_8\}$. Edge $\{v, v_9\}$ should be aligned with an edge in b , so it also gets a counterpart in b . According to the currently chosen pairing π , the edge $\{v, v_6\}$ does not have to be aligned in v , so we do not add a counterpart for it in b .

We do this operation for each boomerang and each incident vertex cover vertex. The resulting graph $G_2(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, \pi)$ has at most thrice as many edges as $G_2(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E})$.



■ **Figure 6** Example situation for $G_2(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, \pi)$ as a basis for the description of the ILP.

Testing and optimally reinserting the 1- and 2-class vertices We now have a plane graph $G_2(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, \pi)$ with $O(2^k)$ vertices. See Figure 6. Some pairs of edges are required to be aligned. The two 2-paths representing the boundary of a boomerang must bound a quadrilateral that does not contain the segment between the two vertex cover vertices. We use Renegar’s algorithm [23, 24] to test whether these requirements are geometrically realizable.

► **Lemma 8.** *Given a plane graph H with embedding \mathcal{E} and K vertices, a set A of pairs of edges, a set B of 4-cycles of H , and for each 4-cycle Q in B a specified diagonal $d(Q)$, we can decide, in $K^{O(K)}$ time, whether there exists a planar straight-line drawing of H such that (i) the edge pairs in A are aligned and (ii) for each 4-cycle Q in B , $d(Q)$ does not lie in the interior of Q or on Q .*

Proof. We use the following simple tool from geometry. Given three points $a = (x_1, y_1)$, $b = (x_2, y_2)$, $c = (x_3, y_3)$ in the plane, let

$$\chi(a, b, c) = \begin{vmatrix} x_1 & y_1 & 1 \\ x_2 & y_2 & 1 \\ x_3 & y_3 & 1 \end{vmatrix}$$

be the scalar triple product of three 3-dimensional vectors $(x_1, y_1, 1)$, $(x_2, y_2, 1)$, and $(x_3, y_3, 1)$. As is well known, the following conditions are equivalent:

- $\chi(a, b, c) > 0$;
- $a \neq b$, and the point c lies in the left halfplane with respect to the oriented line through a and b , oriented from a to b ;
- the points a , b , and c are pairwise distinct, non-collinear, and occur counterclockwise in the circumcircle of the triangle $\triangle abc$ in this order.

Moreover, $\chi(a, b, c) = 0$ if and only if the points a , b , and c are collinear, including the case that some of them coincide.

Let $\{v_1, \dots, v_K\}$ be the vertex set of H . We want to express the fact that there are K pairwise distinct points $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_K, y_K)$ that determine a straight-line drawing of H . Our existential statement Φ about the reals begins, therefore, with the quantifier prefix

$$\exists x_1 \exists y_1 \dots \exists x_K \exists y_K \bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq K} \neg(x_i = x_j \wedge y_i = y_j).$$

For each pair of edges $e = \{u, v\}$ and $f = \{v, w\}$ such that f follows e immediately in the counterclockwise cyclic ordering of the edges incident to v according to \mathcal{E} , we add to Φ the constraint $\chi(u, w, v) > 0$ (using conjugation).

For each 4-cycle $Q = \langle a, b, c, d \rangle \in B$ with $d(Q) = \langle a, c \rangle$, we add to Φ the constraint $\chi(a, b, c) \cdot \chi(a, d, c) > 0$. In other words, $\chi(a, b, c)$ and $\chi(a, d, c)$ must have the same (non-zero) sign.

If there is a pair of edges in A that is not incident, we can reject the instance. For each pair of edges $e = \{u, v\}$ and $f = \{v, w\}$ in A , we add to Φ the constraint $\chi(u, v, w) = 0$. (We could also express that v must lie in the relative interior of the line segment \overline{uw} , but this is implied automatically by the ordering of the edges around v – if there is another edge incident to v . If not, we can remove v and replace the path $\langle u, v, w \rangle$ by the straight-line edge $\{u, w\}$.)

For each pair of non-incident edges $e = \{u, v\}$ and $e' = \{u', v'\}$ of H , we need to ensure that e and e' do not cross each other. This can be expressed using the relation $D(u, v, u', v')$ defined in the proof of [7, Lemma 2.2].

Note that Φ involves $O(K^2)$ polynomials in $2K$ variables, each of constant total degree and with integer coefficients of constant absolute value. Using Renegar’s result (Theorem 2), we can test whether Φ admits a solution over the reals in $K^{O(K)}$ time. \blacktriangleleft

We apply Lemma 8 to $H = G_2(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, \pi)$, setting A according to π , B to the set of all boomerangs, and, for each boomerang b , the specified diagonal $d(b)$ to the segment between the two vertex cover vertices. If the answer is yes, we set up and solve an ILP to optimally insert 2-class vertices into the boomerangs and to optimally add the 1-class vertices. To this end, we use, among others, the following variables: $x_{v,b,d} = x_{v,d,b}$ expresses how many edges in boomerang b should be aligned to edges in boomerang d at vertex v and $y_{v,d}$ expresses how many edges between v and 1-class vertices should be aligned with edges in boomerang d . We allow that some of the boomerangs remain empty. The details of the ILP are as follows.

Description of the ILP We explain the ILP for the optimal distribution of 2-class and 1-class vertices by example. Let d_1 and d_2 be the two gray boomerangs in Figure 6 with vertex cover vertices u and v , let a, b, c be the boomerangs that are incident to u and paired with d , and let g and h be the boomerangs incident to v and paired with d . (Additionally, boomerang f is paired with boomerang c .)

With the respective upper case letters we will denote the respective 2-classes. E.g., D is the 2-class whose vertices are adjacent to u and v since the boomerangs d_1 and d_2 represent contiguous subsets of D . For a 2-class C , let μ_C be the size of C – minus one if $C \in \mathcal{C}$, i.e., if one 2-path through a vertex of C was already modeled by the edge e_C . For the ILP, μ_C is a constant.

Let now b and d be two boomerangs that are paired at the vertex cover vertex v . We introduce an integer variable $x_{v,b,d} = x_{v,d,b}$ for the number of pairs $\{e, e'\}$ of edges such that e is in b , e' is in d , and e and e' are aligned at v .

For each vertex v , let λ_v be the number of leaves (1-classes) incident to v . For the ILP, λ_v is a constant. Further, we introduce an integer variable $y_{v,d}$ for the number of leaves incident to v that are aligned with edges assigned to a boomerang d , and a variable y_v for the number of pairs of leaves incident to v that are aligned with each other. Then, λ_v is an upper bound to the sum of all leaves that are aligned with edges of any boomerang incident to v plus twice the number of pairs of leaves that are aligned with each other. For vertices u and v in Figure 6, this yields the constraints

$$\begin{aligned} y_{v,d_1} + y_{v,d_2} + y_{v,g} + y_{v,h} + 2y_v &\leq \lambda_v, \\ y_{u,a} + y_{u,b} + y_{u,c} + y_{u,d_1} + y_{u,d_2} + y_{u,f} + 2y_u &\leq \lambda_u. \end{aligned}$$

For each vertex v , let x_v be defined as follows:

$$x_v = \sum_{b,d \text{ boomerangs incident to } v} x_{v,b,d} + \sum_{d \text{ boomerang incident to } v} y_{v,d}.$$

For example, in Figure 6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_u &= (x_{u,a,d_2} + x_{u,b,d_1} + x_{u,b,d_2} + x_{u,c,d_1} + x_{u,c,f}) + (y_{u,a} + \dots + y_{u,f}), \\ x_v &= (x_{v,d_1,g} + x_{v,d_1,h} + x_{v,d_2,h}) + (y_{v,d_1} + y_{v,d_2} + y_{v,g} + y_{v,h}). \end{aligned}$$

Then our objective is to

$$\text{maximize } \sum_{v \in V(G)} (x_v + y_v).$$

For a boomerang b incident to vertex cover vertex v , let $\varepsilon_{v,b}$ be the number of edges of G_2 that are paired at v with edges of b . For the ILP, $\varepsilon_{v,b}$ is a constant. For example, in Figure 6, $\varepsilon_{u,d_2} = 1$ due to the edge wu in G_2 , whereas $\varepsilon_{u,d_1} = 0$. We need only one more type of constraints. We establish, for each boomerang d_i representing a contiguous subclass of the 2-class D , a bound z_{d_i} for the number of vertices that have to be contained in d_i in order to satisfy the alignment requirements.

$$\begin{aligned} x_{u,b,d_1} + x_{u,c,d_1} + y_{u,d_1} + \varepsilon_{u,d_1} &\leq z_{d_1} \\ x_{v,g,d_1} + x_{v,h,d_1} + y_{v,d_1} + \varepsilon_{v,d_1} &\leq z_{d_1} \\ x_{u,a,d_2} + x_{u,b,d_2} + y_{u,d_2} + \varepsilon_{u,d_2} &\leq z_{d_2} \\ x_{v,h,d_1} + y_{v,d_2} + \varepsilon_{v,d_2} &\leq z_{d_2} \end{aligned}$$

We also do this for all other 2-classes. Now the following constraint says that the total number of vertices that we distribute to the boomerangs associated with the 2-class D is at most μ_D . In our example, we have

$$z_{d_1} + z_{d_2} \leq \mu_D$$

Note that the edges that belong to aligned pairs coming into a boomerang from one side can always be completed to paths of length 2, either with edges that belong to aligned pairs entering the boomerang from the other side or with usual unconstrained edges.

It remains to analyze the numbers of variables and constraints. Recall that the number of vertices and edges of the plane graph $G_2(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, \pi)$ is in $O(2^k)$. The number of variables of type $y_{v,d}$ and z_d is bounded by the number of edges and, thus, is also in $O(2^k)$. The number of variables of type x_v and y_v is obviously in $O(2^k)$. Finally, for a fixed vertex cover vertex v , the number of variables of type $x_{v,b,d}$ is bounded by $\deg v$: If b is only paired with d , then we assign the cost for the variables $x_{v,b,d} = x_{v,d,b}$ to b . If both, b and d are not only paired with each other, we assign the cost of $x_{v,b,d}$ to b and the cost of $x_{v,d,b}$ to d . Observe that this happens at most twice for each boomerang incident to v . Thus, by the hand shaking lemma, the total number of variables of type $x_{v,b,d}$ is bounded by the number of edges, which is again in $O(2^k)$. There is one constraint for each 1-class, one constraint for each variable of type x_v , two constraints for each variable of type z_d , and one constraint for each 2-class. Thus, the total number of constraints is in $O(2^k)$.

Summarizing the above discussion, the ILP uses $O(2^k)$ variables and constraints and, thus, can be solved in $2^{O(k2^k)}$ time [17, 21, 13].

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

► **Theorem 9.** *SEGMENT NUMBER BY VERTEX COVER NUMBER is FPT.*

Proof. The vertex cover number of the input graph G with n vertices can be computed in $O(kn + 1.274^k)$ time [8]. The number of subsets \mathcal{C} of 2-classes is in $O(2^{3k})$. Then we vary over all embeddings of $G_2(\mathcal{C})$; see the respective paragraph on Page 7. The number of embeddings \mathcal{E} of the graph $G_2(\mathcal{C})$ with $O(2^k)$ vertices is in $O((c2^k)!)$ for some constant c , and the number of possible pairings π is also bounded by a function of k . The plane graph $G_2(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, \pi)$ has $O(2^k)$ vertices. Hence, testing whether the alignment and non-convexity requirements of $G_2(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, \pi)$ can be realized geometrically can be done in $2^{O(k2^k)}$ time. If the answer is yes, we can solve the ILP in $2^{O(k2^k)}$ time. In the end we have to determine the minimum over all choices of $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, \pi$.

In order to prove correctness, consider now a hypothetical geometric realization and an optimum solution of the ILP. Observe that the ILP is always feasible. It remains to show that the 2-class vertices can be inserted into the boomerangs and the 1-class vertices can be added so as to fulfill the alignment requirements prescribed by the ILP. For each triplet (v, b, d) , where b and d are two boomerangs incident to a common vertex cover vertex v , we add $x_{v,b,d}$ stubs of aligned edges in a close vicinity of v inside the region reserved for b and d . Further, for each boomerang d incident to a vertex cover vertex v do the following. For each edge e of G_2 that we required to be aligned with an edge in d at v , we add a stub incident to v into d aligned with e . We also add $y_{v,d}$ stubs incident to v into d . If the total number of stubs in all boomerangs representing contiguous subclasses of a 2-class C are less than $|C|$, we add more stubs into arbitrary boomerangs associated with C . We extend the stubs until the respective rays meet. Observe that this intersection point is inside the boomerang and that no crossings are generated; see Figure 5b. ◀

5 Parameters: Segment and Line Cover Number

In this section, we first study the parameterized complexity of computing the segment number of a planar graph with respect to the segment number and the line cover number separately. Recall that, if $\text{seg}(G) \leq k$, then $\text{line}(G) \leq k$. Then, we study the parameterized complexity of colored versions of the segment number and the line cover number with respect to their natural parameters.

We start by reviewing an FPT algorithm for the line cover number [7]. A *path component* (resp., *cycle component*) of a graph is a connected component isomorphic to a path (resp., a cycle). The algorithm first removes all the path components of the input graph G , as they can be placed on a common line. Then each of the remaining connected components of G is reduced by replacing long maximal paths. More precisely, maximal paths of length greater than $\binom{k}{2}$ that contain only vertices of degree at most 2 are replaced by paths of length $\binom{k}{2}$, and cycle components with more than $\binom{k}{2}$ vertices are replaced by cycles of length $\binom{k}{2}$. Indeed, vertices of degree 2 are irrelevant since they can always be reintroduced by subdividing a straight-line segment of the path in a feasible solution of the reduced instance to obtain a feasible solution of the original instance. Note that the number of vertices of degree greater than 2 must be at most $\binom{k}{2}$. This yields an equivalent instance G' with at most $1.1k^4$ vertices and $2k^4$ edges. Next, the algorithm implicitly enumerates all line arrangements of k lines. For each such arrangement, the algorithm enumerates all possible placements of the vertices of G' at crossing points in the arrangement. Observe that the vertices of degree greater than 2 must be placed at the crossing points of the lines. The instance is accepted if at least one of the line arrangements can host G' .

In order to *explicitly* enumerate all line arrangements of k lines (as needed in Algorithm 1),

we can proceed as described below. Observe that a line arrangement \mathcal{A} of k lines defines a connected plane graph $G_{\mathcal{A}}$ as follows. The graph $G_{\mathcal{A}}$ contains, for each crossing point p in \mathcal{A} , a vertex u_p , and, for every pair of crossing points p and q that appear consecutively along a line of \mathcal{A} , an edge $\{u_p, u_q\}$. Additionally, for each half-line of \mathcal{A} that starts at a crossing point p , the graph $G_{\mathcal{A}}$ contains a leaf adjacent to u_p . The clockwise order of the edges around each vertex u_p of $G_{\mathcal{A}}$ (of degree larger than 1) is naturally inherited from the order of the crossing points of \mathcal{A} around p . By construction, \mathcal{A} defines a *unique* connected plane graph $G_{\mathcal{A}}$ together with a *unique* covering of the edges of $G_{\mathcal{A}}$ with k edge-disjoint paths starting and ending at leaves. Thus, to enumerate all line arrangements of k lines, we execute the following steps. We consider all possible planar graphs with at most $\binom{k}{2} + 2k$ vertices that contain $2k$ leaves, all their planar embeddings, and all their edge coverings with k edge-disjoint paths, if any. For each such triplet (of a planar graph, an embedding, and an edge covering), we test (using again Renegar's algorithm [23, 24]) whether the considered graph admits a planar straight-line drawing preserving the selected embedding, in which each edge-disjoint path of the considered covering is drawn on a straight-line. Each triplet that passes the previous test corresponds to a (combinatorially different) line arrangement of k lines.

To compute the segment number of G , first observe that each path component requires a segment in a drawing of G . Assume that G has p path components. Then, let $k' = k - p$ be our new parameter and remove the path components from G . Also, observe that the choices above only leave undecided to which line of the arrangement the *hanging paths* of G' , i.e., the paths that start at a high degree vertex and end at a degree-1 vertex, are assigned. Clearly, the number of such choices are also bounded by a function of k . Therefore, for every line arrangement and every placement of the vertices of G' to the crossing points of the arrangement, we consider all possible ways to assign the hanging paths to the lines and compute the actual number of segments determined by these choices. We conclude that $\text{seg}(G) \leq k$ if and only if we encountered a line arrangement and a placement of vertices of G' in this line arrangement that determines at most k' segments. This immediately implies the following theorem.

► **Theorem 10.** *SEGMENT NUMBER is FPT with respect to the natural parameter.*

Note that the line cover number is lower or equal to the segment number. However, assuming no path component exists, we can show that the segment number is polynomially bounded by the line cover number.


SEGMENT NUMBER BY LINE COVER NUMBER

Input: A simple planar graph G , an integer s .
Parameter: The line cover number $k = \text{line}(G)$ of G .
Question: Is the segment number of G at most s , that is, $\text{seg}(G) \leq s$?

We exploit the following observation.

► **Proposition 11.** *Let G_1, \dots, G_t be the connected components of a graph G . The following hold:*

1. $\text{seg}(G) = \sum_{i=1}^t \text{seg}(G_i)$.
2. Let G_1, \dots, G_p be the path components of G and let $G' = G \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^p G_i$. Then, $\text{seg}(G) = \text{seg}(G') + p$. Moreover, if $V(G') \neq \emptyset$ then $\text{line}(G) = \text{line}(G')$, and $\text{line}(G) = 1$ otherwise.
3. If G contains no path component, then $\text{seg}(G) \leq \text{line}^2(G)$.



■ **Figure 7** Two routings of the light paths of G on the same pair of a line arrangement and a vertex-placement of $G_{>2}$. The line arrangement is shown by dotted lines, the vertices of $G_{>2}$ are drawn as diamonds, and other vertices are drawn as circles.

Proof. Items 1 and 2 are obvious. For the last item, consider a drawing Γ of G on k lines. Since G has no path component, every segment of Γ must contain at least one of the at most $(k - 1)$ crossing points of the line that supports it. Different segments supported by the same line are disjoint. Therefore, the number of segments of Γ cannot exceed $k(k - 1)$. ◀

► **Lemma 12.** *Computing the segment number is FPT parameterized by the line cover number of the input graph.*

Proof. Suppose that we are given an input graph G with $\text{line}(G) = k$. We first identify its connected components. Let p be the number of path components of G . Delete the path components of G , if any, to obtain a graph G' for which $\text{seg}(G') \leq \text{line}^2(G') = \text{line}^2(G) = k^2$. So the segment number of G' is bounded by a function of k and hence, by Theorem 10, can be computed in FPT time parameterized by k . Once $\text{seg}(G')$ is computed, output $\text{seg}(G) = \text{seg}(G') + p$, by Item 3 of Proposition 11. ◀

Motivated by list coloring, we generalize both SEGMENT NUMBER and LINE COVER NUMBER by prescribing admissible segments or lines for certain edges.

LIST-INCIDENCE SEGMENT NUMBER (LINE COVER NUMBER)

Input: A simple planar graph G and, for each $e \in E(G)$, a list $L(e) \subseteq [k]$.
Parameter: An integer k .
Question: Does there exist a planar straight-line drawing of G and a labeling $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_k$ of the segments (supporting lines) of this drawing such that for every $e \in E(G)$, e is drawn on a segment (line) in $\{\ell_i : i \in L(e)\}$?

► **Theorem 13.** *The problems LIST-INCIDENCE LINE COVER NUMBER and LIST-INCIDENCE SEGMENT NUMBER are FPT with respect to the natural parameter.*

Note that Theorem 13 generalizes Theorem 10, but the algorithm for SEGMENT NUMBER, which yields Theorem 10, is faster than the algorithm for LIST-INCIDENCE SEGMENT NUMBER. In order to prove Theorem 13, we first consider the case where the input does not contain any path or cycle components.

Graphs without Path and Cycle Components We first consider the LIST-INCIDENCE LINE COVER NUMBER problem. Note that a feasible instance can have at most $\binom{k}{2}$ vertices of degree greater than 2. Let $G_{>2}$ be the subgraph of G induced by vertices of degree greater

than 2. We enumerate all possible arrangements of k lines and all possible placements of vertices of G of degrees greater than 2 in the crossing points of the lines. The placement of vertices determines a straight-line drawing of $G_{>2}$, (see green edges in Figure 7). We continue with the considered arrangement/vertex-placement pair only if the drawing of $G_{>2}$ is *proper*, i.e., it is planar, and each edge of $G_{>2}$ belongs to a line of the arrangement and does not pass through another vertex of degree greater than 2. A line segment that connects two consecutive crossing points and does not correspond to an edge of $G_{>2}$ is called a *gap*. Let a and b be two gaps. We say that a is *aligned* to b (in this order) if they belong to the same line and the ending point of a is the starting point of b . Further, a is *adjacent* to b (in this order) if they do not belong to the same line and the ending point of a is the starting point of b .

Now consider a path $P = \langle u_0, u_1, \dots, u_t \rangle$ in G such that $\deg(u_0) > 2$, i.e., $u_0 \in V(G_{>2})$, $\deg(u_1) = \deg(u_2) = \dots = \deg(u_{t-1}) = 2$, and $\deg(u_t)$ is either 1 or greater than 2. We call such a path *light*. Consider the representation of a light path in a solution. The path leaves the vertex u_0 along some line, then turns to another line, possibly several times, until it either ends in a crossing point, where vertex u_t had been placed (when $\deg(u_t) > 2$) or in an inner point of some gap (when $\deg(u_t) = 1$, note that w.l.o.g. we may assume that vertices of degree 1 are not placed in crossing points). This describes the *routing* of P . Every maximal sequence of consecutive gaps that belong to the same line will be called a *supergap* in the routing. In particular, we can represent a routing R of P by the sequence $\langle S_1, S_2, \dots, S_h \rangle$ of supergaps such that S_i and S_{i+1} are consecutive. Every two consecutive gaps within a supergap are aligned, while for two consecutive supergaps, the last gap of the first one is adjacent to the first gap of the second one (see Figure 7).

We use the following strategy. For every light path, we select its routing as a sequence of supergaps. Furthermore, we enumerate over all possible $k!$ namings of the lines of the arrangement with labels in $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_k$ and proceed only with those namings that determine a *compatible drawing* of $G_{>2}$, i.e., one in which, for each edge e of $G_{>2}$, it holds that e lies on a line ℓ_i with $i \in L(e)$.

Let \mathcal{R} be a collection of routings for the light paths. We check if \mathcal{R} is *feasible*, i.e., any two routings in \mathcal{R} are non-crossing and internally disjoint, and each of them is internally disjoint with the drawing of $G_{>2}$. For every light path, we check for each of its edges e whether the list $L(e)$ allows its allocation along this routing. The first supergap S_1 of a routing must start in vertex u_0 . The last one must end in u_t if $\deg(u_t) > 2$. (If $\deg(u_t) = 1$, there is no restriction on S_h .)

The strategy described above is summarized in Algorithm 1. To check whether the lists assigned to the edges of a path allow their allocation along a given routing, Algorithm 1 exploits the procedure CHECKROUTING (see Algorithm 2), which works as follows. For a light path $P = \langle u_0, u_1, \dots, u_t \rangle$ and a routing $R = \langle S_1, S_2, \dots, S_h \rangle$, we fill a table $CR(i, j) \in \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$, $i = 1, \dots, t$, $j = 1, \dots, h$ via dynamic programming. Its meaning is that $CR(i, j) = \text{true}$ if and only if the subpath $P_i = P[u_0, \dots, u_i]$ is *realizable* along $R_j = \langle S_1, \dots, S_j \rangle$, i.e., it admits a planar geometric realization such that all the vertices u_1, u_2, \dots, u_i are placed inside the supergaps of R_j and every edge $e \in P_i$ lies on a line whose index is in the list $L(e)$.

The correctness of Algorithm 1 follows from the fact that we are performing an exhaustive exploration of the solution space. The correctness of Algorithm 2 follows from the fact that $P_i = \langle u_0, \dots, u_i \rangle$ can be realized along the initial part $\langle S_1, \dots, S_j \rangle$ of R so that vertex u_i is placed inside the supergap S_j if and only if P_i can be realized so that u_i is placed on the crossing point that is the last point of S_j . The former is used (and needed) when updating

■ **Algorithm 1** LISTLINECOVERNUMBER(G, k, L)

Input : A planar graph G , an integer k , and for each $e \in E(G)$, a list $L(e) \subseteq [k]$.
Output : true if and only if there exists a planar straight-line drawing of G and a labelling $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_k$ of the supporting lines of this drawing such that for every $e \in E(G)$, e is drawn on a line in $\{\ell_i : i \in L(e)\}$.

```

foreach arrangement  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $k$  lines do
  foreach placement  $\mathcal{P}$  of vertices of degree greater than 2 into crossing points of  $\mathcal{A}$ 
  do
    if  $\mathcal{P}$  determines a proper drawing of  $G_{>2}$  then
      foreach collection of routings  $\mathcal{R}$  of light paths of  $G$  do
        foreach naming of the lines in  $\mathcal{A}$  with labels in  $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_k$  do
          if  $\mathcal{R}$  is feasible and the drawing of  $G_{>2}$  is compatible then
             $X \leftarrow \text{true}$ ;
            foreach light path  $P$  and its routing  $R_P \in \mathcal{R}$  do
               $X \leftarrow X \wedge \text{CHECKROUTING}(P, R_P, L)$ 
            if  $X = \text{true}$  then
              return true
  return false

```

$CR(i, j)$ to $CR(i + 1, j)$, the latter for updating $CR(i, j)$ to $CR(i + 1, j + 1)$.

The following lemma states that Algorithm 1 is FPT with respect to k .

► **Lemma 14.** *Let $F(k)$ be the time needed to enumerate all non-isomorphic line arrangements of k lines. Then Algorithm 1 runs in time $O(F(k)k^{k^6+3k}n)$.*

Proof. Recall that there are 5 nested *for loops* in Algorithm 1. For the running time estimate of Algorithm 1, we note first that Algorithm 2 takes $O(t \cdot h \log k)$ time since the table has $t \cdot h$ entries and the update step requires searching through an at-most- k -element list. Since $t \leq n$ and the number h of supergaps on a routing cannot exceed the total number of gaps, which is no more than k^2 , the running time of Algorithm 2 is upper bounded by $O(nk^2 \log k)$. Since both the light paths and the routings in a collection of paths/routings are pairwise disjoint, $O(nk^2 \log k)$ is actually an upper bound on the total execution time of the innermost (fifth) *for loop* of Algorithm 1, where the procedure CHECKROUTING is called on every light path and a corresponding given routing for the path.

Clearly, the number $Arr(k)$ of non-isomorphic line arrangements of k lines is upper bounded by the number of planar graphs with at most $\binom{k}{2} + 2k$ vertices that contain $2k$ leaves i.e., $Arr(k) \in 2^{O(k^2)}$. Therefore, the enumeration of all such arrangements in the outermost (first) *for loop* can be performed in $F(k)$ time, where F is a computable function [7].

Since there are at most $\binom{k}{2}$ crossing points of the lines, the vertices of degree greater than 2 can be placed in at most $\binom{k}{2}!$ ways, which bounds the number of times the second *for loop* is executed.

Inside the second *for loop*, we first check if $G_{>2}$ is proper. For this, we test for each edge of $G_{>2}$, if it belongs to a line of the arrangement and if it does not pass through any vertex of $G_{>2}$. There are $O(k^2)$ edges to be checked and on each of them at most $k - 3$ other crossing points that could create a conflict, and so this check can be performed in $O(k^3)$ time. (This also includes checking if no two edges of $G_{>2}$ cross.)

In a feasible instance, there is no more than k^3 light paths, because they start in one

■ **Algorithm 2** CHECKROUTING(P, R_P, L)

Input : A light path P , a routing R_P , and for each $e \in E(G)$, a list $L(e) \subseteq [k]$.
Output : true if and only if P is realizable along R_P .
// Initialization of the table
for $i = 1$ **to** t **do**
 for $i = 1$ **to** h **do**
 $CR(i, j) \leftarrow \text{false};$
 $\ell_x \leftarrow$ the supporting line of S_1 ;
if $x \in L(\{u_0, u_1\})$ **then**
 $CR(1, 1) \leftarrow \text{true};$
// Update of the table
for $i = 1$ **to** $t - 1$ **do**
 for $i = 1$ **to** h **do**
 $\ell_x \leftarrow$ the supporting line of S_j ;
 if $CR(i, j)$ **and** $x \in L(\{u_i, u_{i+1}\})$ **then**
 $CR(i + 1, j) \leftarrow \text{true};$
 if $j < h$ **then**
 $\ell_y \leftarrow$ the supporting line of S_{j+1} ;
 if $CR(i, j)$ **and** $y \in L(\{u_i, u_{i+1}\})$ **then**
 $CR(i + 1, j + 1) \leftarrow \text{true};$
// Return feasibility
return $CR(t, h);$

of at most $\binom{k}{2}$ vertices and in each starting vertex, the first edge of the path has at most $2k$ choices (there are at most k lines passing through this point, and on each of them two possible directions to be used). A routing of a light path is a sequence of at most $k(k-1)/2$ supergaps since each line may host at most $(k-1)/2$ disjoint supergaps. The first supergap on a routing can be chosen in at most $2k(k-1) \in O(k^2)$ ways (the routing chooses a line to follow, the direction, and the last point of this supergap). Similarly, the second supergap can be chosen in $O(k^2)$ ways, etc. Thus routing one path can be chosen in at most $(2k(k-1))^{k(k-1)/2} < (2k)^{k(k-1)} = k^{k(k-1) \log k} \in O(k^{k^2 \log k})$ ways, and the collection of routing in $(O(k^{k^2 \log k}))^{k^3} = O(k^{k^5 \log k})$ ways. Thus the number of choices in the third *for loop* is at most $O(k^{k^5 \log k})$.

Since there exists at most $k!$ ways of the naming of the lines of the arrangement, the fourth *for loop* introduces a multiplicative factor of $k!$ in the running time.

Therefore, the overall running time of Algorithm 1 is

$$O\left(F(k) \binom{k}{2}! \left(k^3 + k^{k^5 \log k} k! n k^2 \log k\right)\right) \subseteq O\left(F(k) k^{k^6 + 3k}\right) n.$$

Thus the algorithm is FPT when parameterized by k . ◀

We now consider the LIST-INCIDENCE SEGMENT NUMBER problem. As already mentioned, any realization with k segments is itself a realization with at most k lines. Thus, we can use Algorithm 1, with just two slight modifications. Observe that, in the third *for loop* of the algorithm, the considered collection of routings of the light paths together with the drawing of $G_{>2}$ uniquely determines the segments of the representation. Therefore, we only proceed to the fourth *for loop* with those collections that determine at most k segments. However, if

we proceed, in the fourth *for loop*, we consider all possible namings of these segments instead of considering all possible namings of the lines of the current arrangement. Clearly, the notion of compatible drawing of $G_{>2}$ is naturally modified using the segment labels. Finally, note that counting the number of segments affects the running time by a factor that depends solely on k .

Handling Path and Cycle Components To complete the proof of Theorem 13, we now show how to modify Algorithm 1 to handle cycle and path components. Somewhat surprisingly, paths are the most troublemaking components.

First, we consider the cycle components. A cycle component C cannot be drawn on a line, and thus any of its drawings must bend in a crossing point. Then it can be described by a closed routing of supergaps, and we include such a routing in the third *for loop* of Algorithm 1. The subroutine CHECKROUTING is modified as follows: We pick one of the bending points and try all possibilities which vertex of the component C is placed in this crossing point and in which direction the cycle C travels around the chosen cyclic routing. This adds a multiplicative factor $2|C| = O(n)$ to the overall running time of the algorithm.

Second, we consider the path components. Let P be such a component. If P has a *universal index*, i.e., if there is an index i which belongs to all $L(e), e \in P$, we can realize this path on line ℓ_i in some sector which does not belong to any routing nor to edges of $G_{>2}$ (in case of LIST-INCIDENCE LINE COVER NUMBER) not affecting the realizability of the rest of the graph. Thus, such paths can be ignored for LIST-INCIDENCE LINE COVER NUMBER.

However, in the LIST-INCIDENCE SEGMENT NUMBER problem, it may be favourable to use bends even if the path has a universal index in the lists of its vertices, as this may prevent other components of the graph to be routed along the segment corresponding to the universal index. Moreover, even if we decide to route the path along a segment corresponding to one of the universal indices of the path, the feasibility of the instance may depend on which index we use. However, since the segment number of a graph equals the sum of the segment numbers of its connected components, the number of components of a feasible instance is always bounded by k . Thus, for every path component P , we check whether the set of universal indices, i.e., $\bigcap_{e \in P} L(e)$, is non-empty. If this is the case, we (i) decide whether we realize P as a single segment, and if so, (ii) what is the index of this segment. This leaves $O(k)$ possibilities to try, and for each of them, we delete the index of this segment from all lists of other components. Then we proceed with the rest of the graph. Altogether, we have refined the search tree by a factor of $(k + 1)!$.

For paths with a universal index that were chosen to be represented with bends, and for paths that must be realized with bends (since they do not have any universal index), we use the routing approach (both in case of LIST-INCIDENCE SEGMENT NUMBER and LIST-INCIDENCE LINE COVER NUMBER) as described in the case of cycle components. Therefore, processing these components affects the running time by a multiplicative factor of $O(n)$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 13.

6 Open Problems

We have shown that segment number parameterized by segment number, line cover number, and vertex cover number is fixed parameter tractable. Another interesting parameter would be the treewidth. So far, even for treewidth 2, efficient optimal algorithms are only known for some subclasses [1, 26, 14].

The *cluster deletion number* of a graph is the minimum number of vertices that have

to be removed such that the remainder is a union of disjoint cliques. Clearly, the cluster deletion number is always upper-bounded by the vertex cover number. Is the segment number problem FPT with respect to the cluster deletion number?

References

- 1 Muhammad Abdullah Adnan. Minimum segment drawings of outerplanar graphs. Master's thesis, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology (BUET), Dhaka, 2008. URL: <http://lib.buet.ac.bd:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/1565/Full%20%20Thesis%20.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.
- 2 Martin Balko, Steven Chaplick, Siddharth Gupta, Michael Hoffmann, Pavel Valtr, and Alexander Wolff. Bounding and computing obstacle numbers of graphs. In Shiri Chechik, Gonzalo Navarro, Eva Rotenberg, and Grzegorz Herman, editors, *ESA 2022*, volume 244 of *LIPICs*, pages 11:1–13, Schloss Dagstuhl, 2022. Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ESA.2022.11.
- 3 Marcel Berger. *Geometry Revealed: A Jacob's Ladder to Modern Higher Geometry*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-70997-8_1.
- 4 Sujoy Bhore, Robert Ganian, Fabrizio Montecchiani, and Martin Nöllenburg. Parameterized algorithms for book embedding problems. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 24(4):603–620, 2020. doi:10.7155/jgaa.00526.
- 5 Sujoy Bhore, Robert Ganian, Fabrizio Montecchiani, and Martin Nöllenburg. Parameterized algorithms for queue layouts. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 26(3):335–352, 2022. doi:10.7155/jgaa.00597.
- 6 Steven Chaplick, Krzysztof Fleszar, Fabian Lipp, Alexander Ravsky, Oleg Verbitsky, and Alexander Wolff. Drawing graphs on few lines and few planes. *J. Comput. Geom.*, 11(1):433–475, 2020. doi:10.20382/jocg.v11i1a17.
- 7 Steven Chaplick, Krzysztof Fleszar, Fabian Lipp, Alexander Ravsky, Oleg Verbitsky, and Alexander Wolff. The complexity of drawing graphs on few lines and few planes. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 27(6):459–488, 2023. doi:10.7155/jgaa.00630.
- 8 Jianer Chen, Iyad A. Kanj, and Ge Xia. Improved upper bounds for vertex cover. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 411(40-42):3736–3756, 2010. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2010.06.026.
- 9 Sabine Cornelsen, Giordano Da Lozzo, Luca Grilli, Siddharth Gupta, Jan Kratochvíl, and Alexander Wolff. The parametrized complexity of the segment number. In Michael A. Bekos and Markus Chimani, editors, *GD 2023*, volume 14466 of *LNCS*, pages 97–113, Cham, 2023. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-49275-4_7.
- 10 Vida Dujmović, David Eppstein, Matthew Suderman, and David R. Wood. Drawings of planar graphs with few slopes and segments. *Comput. Geom.*, 38:194–212, 2007. doi:10.1016/j.comgeo.2006.09.002.
- 11 Stephane Durocher and Debajyoti Mondal. Drawing plane triangulations with few segments. *Comput. Geom.*, 77:27–39, 2019. doi:10.1016/j.comgeo.2018.02.003.
- 12 Stephane Durocher, Debajyoti Mondal, Rahnema Islam Nishat, and Sue Whitesides. A note on minimum-segment drawings of planar graphs. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 17(3):301–328, 2013. doi:10.7155/jgaa.00295.
- 13 András Frank and Éva Tardos. An application of simultaneous diophantine approximation in combinatorial optimization. *Combinatorica*, 7(1):49–65, 1987. doi:10.1007/BF02579200.
- 14 Ina Goëßmann, Jonathan Klawitter, Boris Klemz, Felix Klesen, Stephen G. Kobourov, Myroslav Kryven, Alexander Wolff, and Johannes Zink. The segment number: Algorithms and universal lower bounds for some classes of planar graphs. In Michael A. Bekos and Michael Kaufmann, editors, *WG 2022*, volume 13453 of *LNCS*, pages 271–286, Cham, 2022. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-15914-5_20.

- 15 Gregor Hültenschmidt, Philipp Kindermann, Wouter Meulemans, and André Schulz. Drawing planar graphs with few geometric primitives. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 22(2):357–387, 2018. doi:10.7155/jgaa.00473.
- 16 Alexander Igamberdiev, Wouter Meulemans, and André Schulz. Drawing planar cubic 3-connected graphs with few segments: Algorithms & experiments. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 21(4):561–588, 2017. doi:10.7155/jgaa.00430.
- 17 Ravi Kannan. Minkowski’s convex body theorem and integer programming. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 12(3):415–440, 1987. doi:10.1287/moor.12.3.415.
- 18 Philipp Kindermann, Tamara Mchedlidze, Thomas Schneck, and Antonios Symvonis. Drawing planar graphs with few segments on a polynomial grid. In Daniel Archambault and Csaba D. Tóth, editors, *GD 2019*, volume 11904 of *LNCS*, pages 416–429, Cham, 2019. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-35802-0\32.
- 19 Philipp Kindermann, Wouter Meulemans, and André Schulz. Experimental analysis of the accessibility of drawings with few segments. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 22(3):501–518, 2018. doi:10.7155/jgaa.00474.
- 20 Myroslav Kryven, Alexander Ravsky, and Alexander Wolff. Drawing graphs on few circles and few spheres. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 23(2):371–391, 2019. doi:10.7155/jgaa.00495.
- 21 Hendrik W. Lenstra Jr. Integer programming with a fixed number of variables. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 8(4):538–548, 1983. doi:10.1287/moor.8.4.538.
- 22 Yoshio Okamoto, Alexander Ravsky, and Alexander Wolff. Variants of the segment number of a graph. In Daniel Archambault and Csaba D. Tóth, editors, *GD 2019*, volume 11904 of *LNCS*, pages 430–443, Cham, 2019. Springer. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1908.08871>, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-35802-0\33.
- 23 James Renegar. On the computational complexity and geometry of the first-order theory of the reals. Part I: Introduction. Preliminaries. The geometry of semi-algebraic sets. The decision problem for the existential theory of the reals. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 13(3):255–299, 1992. doi:10.1016/S0747-7171(10)80003-3.
- 24 James Renegar. On the computational complexity and geometry of the first-order theory of the reals. Part II: The general decision problem. Preliminaries for quantifier elimination. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 13(3):301–327, 1992. doi:10.1016/S0747-7171(10)80004-5.
- 25 James Renegar. On the computational complexity and geometry of the first-order theory of the reals. Part III: Quantifier elimination. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 13(3):329–352, 1992. doi:10.1016/S0747-7171(10)80005-7.
- 26 Md. Abul Hassan Samee, Md. Jawaherul Alam, Muhammad Abdullah Adnan, and Md. Saidur Rahman. Minimum segment drawings of series-parallel graphs with the maximum degree three. In Ioannis G. Tollis and Maurizio Patrignani, editors, *GD 2008*, volume 5417 of *LNCS*, pages 408–419, Cham, 2008. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-00219-9\40.
- 27 Marcus Schaefer. Complexity of some geometric and topological problems. In David Eppstein and Emden R. Gansner, editors, *GD 2009*, volume 5849 of *LNCS*, pages 334–344, Cham, 2010. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-11805-0\32.
- 28 André Schulz. Drawing graphs with few arcs. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 19(1):393–412, 2015. doi:10.7155/jgaa.00366.
- 29 Alex Scott and Paul Seymour. Induced subgraphs of graphs with large chromatic number. VI. Banana trees. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 145:487–510, 2020. doi:10.1016/j.jctb.2020.01.004.