

# Decomposing Triangulations into 4-Connected Components

Sabine Cornelsen and Gregor Diatzko

University of Konstanz

sabine.cornelsen@uni-konstanz.de, gregor.diatzko@uni-konstanz.de

**Abstract.** A connected graph is 4-connected if it contains at least five vertices and removing any three of them does not disconnect it. A frequent preprocessing step in graph drawing is to decompose a plane graph into its 4-connected components and to determine their nesting structure. A linear-time algorithm for this problem was already proposed by Kant. However, using common graph data structures, we found the subroutine dealing with triangulated graphs difficult to implement in such a way that it actually runs in linear time. As a drop-in replacement, we provide a different, easy-to-implement linear-time algorithm that decomposes a triangulated graph into its 4-connected components and computes the respective nesting structure. The algorithm is based on depth-first search.

**Keywords:** 4-connected components, 4-block tree, planar graph, depth-first search, linear time

## 1 Introduction

A connected graph is  $k$ -connected if it contains at least  $k + 1$  vertices and removing at most  $k - 1$  vertices from it yields a connected graph. A planar graph is a *triangulation* or *triangulated* if it is *simple*, i.e., there are no loops nor parallel edges, and each face is bounded by a *triangle*, i.e., a simple cycle of length three. A triangulation is 4-connected if it does not contain a *separating triangle*, i.e., a triangle that does not bound a face. 4-connected triangulations are *Hamiltonian* [15], i.e., they contain a spanning simple cycle. Some algorithms or concepts for drawing planar graphs only work if the graph is 4-connected. Prominent examples are rectangular duals [2,12], the canonical 4-ordering [12], and compact visibility representations [9].

In order to apply these approaches also for planar graphs that are not 4-connected, one possibility is to first triangulate the graph [3] and then to split the triangulation along its separating triangles.<sup>1</sup> See Fig. 1. After treating the *4-connected components*, i.e., the thus constructed connected components (nearly) independently, a drawing of the original graph is then constructed by combining the drawings of the components. See, e.g., the construction of planar L-drawings of bimodal graphs [1] or the construction of compact visibility representations [11]. The *4-block-tree* of a triangulation is the nesting structure of

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed description on how to split a triangle see Page 3.

its decomposition into its 4-connected components, i.e., the vertices of the 4-block-tree are the 4-connected components and there is an edge from a triangle  $t$  of a component  $C$  to a component  $C'$  if  $t$  is the outer face of  $C'$ . See Fig. 1. 4-block-trees are also used in order to compute large matchings fast [14] and to find Tutte paths [4] or rook-drawings with few bends [5].




Fig. 1: A triangulation and the nesting structure of its 4-connected components.

Kanevsky et al. [10] discussed 4-connected components of general graphs. Kant described a method for splitting a planar graph into 4-connected components in [11] and gave more details for a linear time implementation in his PhD thesis [13]. The algorithm works as follows. (i) First it splits the graph into its 3-connected components. (ii) Using an approach of Biedl, Kant, and Kaufmann [3], the separating triples are identified, connected by edges, and the graph is triangulated. If the graph was already a triangulation, the separating triangles can also be identified in linear time by first computing the list  $T$  of all triangles using the algorithm of Chiba and Nishizeki [7] and by then removing those triangles from  $T$  that bound a face. (iii) Finally the graph is split along the separating triangles and links between components with copies of the same triangle are established. In order to do so in linear time, Kant proposes to process the triangles in a certain order, such that for each edge  $e$  of the just split triangle  $t$ , the interior of each separating triangle that contains  $e$  are either all contained in the interior of  $t$  or all in the exterior of  $t$ . Each split is then performed in constant time. The latter is only possible with a special graph data structure. Details are described in Sect. 2.1.

When trying to implement Step iii of Kant's method, we found it difficult to understand and to realize it in such a way that it really works in linear

time. Some problems are discussed in Sect. 2.2. In this paper we present a new and different approach for Step iii, i.e., for computing the 4-block tree of a triangulation. Our algorithm is comparably easy to implement and directly yields the hierarchy of 4-connected components of a triangulation by ordering the separating triangles from innermost to outermost. Splitting the triangles in this order, we can spend time proportional to the size of the interior of the split triangle and still have an overall linear run time. Thus, our algorithm works with any common graph data structure. Our method is based on depth-first search and follows an approach similar to the one used in the realization of the left-right planarity test as described by Brandes [6]. An implementation of the algorithm using the OGDF framework [8] is available at <https://gitlab.inf.uni-konstanz.de/gregor.diatzko/4connected>.

## 2 Kant's Algorithm

We shortly describe a way how Kant's algorithm could be interpreted and discuss some of its problems.

### 2.1 Description

A triangulation  $G$  is *split along a separating triangle*  $t$  with vertices  $v_1, v_2, v_3$  as follows: Three new vertices  $v'_1, v'_2, v'_3$  together with the three edges  $\{v'_1, v'_2\}$ ,  $\{v'_2, v'_3\}$ , and  $\{v'_3, v'_1\}$  are added to  $G$ . We call them a copy of  $t$ . The (edges to the) neighbors of  $v_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  in the interior of  $t$  are transferred from the (incidence) adjacency list of  $v_i$  to the respective list of  $v'_i$ . (Alternatively the neighbors from the exterior of  $t$  can be transferred to the copy of  $t$ .)

In order to split the graph along the separating triangles, Kant [11,13] maintains the list  $T$  of all separating triangles and pointers from the vertices and edges of the separating triangles in  $T$  to the entries in the graph. These pointers would have to be updated after a split if the resulting vertex or edge was now a copy. In order to avoid this, Kant suggests to split the separating triangles in a specific order. The idea is that whenever the graph is split at a separating triangle  $t$  into two graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , then the remaining separating triangles that share an edge  $e$  with  $t$  are either all contained in  $G_1$  or all in  $G_2$ . This will be the subgraph where the original edge  $e$  of  $t$  will stay, while the copy goes to the other subgraph.

To this end Kant defines a (labeled) directed graph  $D$  on the separating triangles. The details in [11] and [13] differ slightly and are both not completely correct. Here we give an interpretation of the version in [13]: Each separating triangle  $t$  is stored at each of its three edges. Now the vertices are processed in an arbitrary order. For each vertex  $v$ , let  $w_0, \dots, w_{d-1}$  be the adjacent vertices of  $v$  in clockwise order around  $v$ . Let  $w_i, i = 1, \dots, d-1$  be a neighbor of  $v$  that was not processed before  $v$ . Let  $t = \langle v, w_i, w_j \rangle$  and let  $t' = \langle v, w_i, w_k \rangle$  be two triangles that share the edge  $\{v, w_i\}$ . Then there is an edge from  $t$  to  $t'$  labeled




Fig. 2: (a) Omitting transitive edges, the separating triangles sharing the edge  $\{v, w_3\}$  are linked  $\langle v, w_3, w_5 \rangle \rightarrow \langle v, w_3, w_6 \rangle \rightarrow \langle v, w_3, w_7 \rangle \rightarrow \langle v, w_3, w_8 \rangle \rightarrow \langle v, w_3, w_0 \rangle \rightarrow \langle v, w_3, w_1 \rangle$  in Kant's Algorithm. (b) Processing  $v$  first, graph  $D$  is the directed triangle  $\langle v, w_0, w_1 \rangle \rightarrow \langle v, w_0, w_2 \rangle = \langle v, w_2, w_0 \rangle \rightarrow \langle v, w_2, w_1 \rangle = \langle v, w_1, w_2 \rangle \rightarrow \langle v, w_1, w_0 \rangle$ .

$\{v, w_i\}$  if and only if  $(j - i) \bmod d < (k - i) \bmod d$ . See Fig. 2 for examples. Observe that  $D$  does not have to be acyclic. See Fig. 2b.

Now a triangle  $t$  may be split if for each edge  $e$  contained in  $t$ , the directed graph  $D$  either contains no incoming edge labeled  $e$  or no outgoing edge labeled  $e$ . Observe that an innermost separating triangle always fulfills this property. E.g., in the example in Fig. 2a, the triangles could be split in the order  $\langle v, w_3, w_i \rangle$ ,  $i = 5, 6, 7, 8, 0, 1$ , where the first three triangles leave the remaining separating triangles in the exterior while the last three triangles leave the remaining separating triangles in their interior.

## 2.2 Problems

Kant's algorithm has several problems.

1. The number of edges in the directed graph  $D$  might be quadratic in the number of vertices of the input graph. So  $D$  must not be computed entirely. It would suffice, however, to compute a transitive reduction of  $D$ . This could be done in linear time by sorting the separating triangles  $\langle v, w_i, w_j \rangle$  containing the edge  $\{v, w_i\}$  according to  $j - i$  using bucket sort.
2. With this approach it is impossible to maintain the pointers from the separating triangles to their vertices in the graph without updating them after a split as mentioned by Kant. However, it suffices to maintain pointers from the separating triangles to the entries of their edges in the incidence lists.
3. Since the triangles are not necessarily processed inside out, the nesting structure is not immediately obtained during the construction. Moreover, in each splitting step it has to be decided to which component the copy of the separating triangle has to go; more precisely this decision has to be made for every single edge of the separating triangle independently.
4. Finally, the running time of Kant's algorithm relies on the fact that a split can be performed in constant time. This is true if only the adjacency lists of the vertices of the separating triangles have to be split. But if we also

want to make sure that the neighbors of a split triangle “know” whether they are adjacent to the original vertex or the copy, then this is no longer true. Moreover, if incidence lists are used instead of adjacency lists, then it is impossible to maintain the end vertices for all edges in constant time per split.

Problem 4 can be mitigated by maintaining incidence lists with “symbolic” edges that do not know their end vertices. I.e., each vertex is associated with a cyclic list. The size of the list is unknown. The entries of the lists are distinct identifiers. Two vertices are adjacent if their cyclic lists contain the same identifiers. But the cyclic list of a vertex alone contains no information about its neighbors. This information can only be obtained in a postprocessing step. However, this rules out the use of any common graph data structure. In effect, e.g., the function in OGDF for splitting vertices has a running time that is linear in the number of edges being transferred to the copy.

To summarize, Kant’s approach seems to be realizable in linear time. However, it has several disadvantages. Thus, we describe our new approach in the next two sections. It is based on ordering the separating triangles from innermost to outermost.

### 3 Algorithm Overview

Throughout the remainder of this paper, let  $G = (V, E)$  be a triangulation with a fixed outer face. We compute the 4-block tree of  $G$  as follows.

*1. Listing separating triangles.* First we compute the list of all triangles of  $G$  using the algorithm of Chiba and Nishizeki [7]. Then we remove the face boundaries from that list, i.e., the triangles  $\langle u, v, w \rangle$  where the edges to  $v$  and  $w$  appear consecutively in the incidence list of  $u$ . This yields the list  $T$  of separating triangles of  $G$ .

*2. Ordering separating triangles.* In the next step, we order the separating triangles in  $T$  such that if triangle  $t$  contains the interior of triangle  $t'$  in its interior then  $t'$  is before  $t$ . E.g., in Fig. 1,  $t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4$  would be an appropriate ordering of the separating triangles. In this step we also compute for each separating triangle  $t$  an oriented reference edge  $e$  such that the interior of  $t$  is to the left of  $e$ . This step is the main difference to Kant’s approach [11]. It is based on depth-first search and described in detail in the next section.

*3. Splitting along separating triangles.* We process the separating triangles in the order computed in Step 2, i.e., innermost triangles are considered first. For each separating triangle  $t$  make copies  $v'_1, v'_2, v'_3$  of its three vertices  $v_1, v_2, v_3$ , and add the three edges  $\{v'_1, v'_2\}, \{v'_2, v'_3\}, \{v'_3, v'_1\}$ . Starting from the reference edge  $e$  of  $t$ , transfer the edges in the interior of  $t$  that are incident to  $v_i, i = 1, 2, 3$  from the incidence list of  $v_i$  to the incidence list of  $v'_i$ :

More precisely, assume that  $e = (v_1, v_2)$  is the reference edge. Starting at  $e$  walk through the incidence list of  $v_1$  in counter-clockwise direction until  $\{v_1, v_3\}$  is reached. Remove each edge of the incidence list of  $v_1$  between  $\{v_1, v_2\}$  and  $\{v_1, v_3\}$  from the incidence list of  $v_1$  and insert it into the incidence list of  $v'_1$ . Consider now  $(v_3, v_1)$  and later  $(v_2, v_3)$  as the new reference edge, and continue. This can be done in time linear in the number of transferred edges. Observe that each edge is transferred at most once during the course of the algorithm.

Now the connected component  $H$  containing  $v'_1$  is a 4-connected component of  $G$ . To store the nesting structure, we set a pointer from the reference edge of  $t$  to  $H$ . This is a *preliminary child pointer*. E.g., assume that the reference edge of triangle  $t_1$  in Fig. 1 is  $(s, z)$ . When we split the triangle  $t_3$ , then  $(s, z)$  is still an edge of (the remainder of)  $G$ . But the triangle  $t_1$  that should be the parent of  $H_1$  is now a face of the just constructed component  $H_3$ . So when we split a triangle obtaining a 4-connected component  $H$ , we test whether an involved edge  $e$  of  $G$  is a reference edge of a triangle  $t'$  of  $G$  with preliminary child component  $H'$  and if so, we set the *parent* of  $H'$  to be the copy  $e'$  of  $e$  in  $H$ .

## 4 Ordering Separating Triangles from Inner- to Outermost

In this section, we show how the list of separating triangles of a triangulation can be ordered in linear time such that innermost triangles are first, i.e., such that a triangle  $t$  is before a triangle  $t'$  if  $t$  is contained in  $t'$ . We will first describe the algorithm, then provide a proof of its correctness, and finally give more details on how to implement it in linear time. A complete pseudocode is provided in the appendix.

We start with a definition. For a vertex  $v$  and two of its neighbors  $u$  and  $w$  we denote by  $\|\angle uvw\| \in \{0, \dots, \text{DEG}(v)\}$  the *size of the angle* between the edges  $\{v, u\}$  and  $\{v, w\}$  at  $v$  in the following sense: starting from the edge  $\{v, u\}$ , count the number of edges one has to turn counter-clockwise (CCW) until one sees the edge  $\{v, w\}$ . In Fig. 3a, we have  $\|\angle qsz\| = 2$  while  $\|\angle zsq\| = 5$ . During the algorithm we want to compute the size of an angle in constant time. To this end, before the algorithm, we number the entries in the incidence list of each vertex  $v$  in CCW order starting at an arbitrary entry; let these numbers be  $\text{INDEX}_v(x)$  for the entry of the neighbor  $x$  of  $v$ . Now the size of the angle  $\|\angle uvw\|$  is  $(\text{INDEX}_v(w) - \text{INDEX}_v(u)) \bmod \text{DEG}(v)$ .

Motivated by [6], we perform depth-first search (DFS) twice, starting from a vertex  $r$  incident to the outer face. DFS explores the graph as far as possible before backtracking using a stack. In the following we consider edges to be directed as traversed during the first DFS. DFS partitions the edges of the graph into *tree edges*, along which new vertices were discovered, and *back edges*, which point from a vertex to one of its ancestors; each edge fits into one of these two classes. Let the tree edge along which a vertex  $v \neq r$  was discovered be the *parent edge* of  $v$ . For ease of exposition, we consider the parent edge of  $r$  to be a virtual edge pointing into the outer face. For each back edge  $b$ , we call




Fig. 3: The maximum edge label of a triangle  $t$  is the moment  $\text{TIME}[t]$  when  $t$  was discovered.  $\text{TIME}[t_1] = 5$ ,  $\text{TIME}[t_2] = 10$ , and  $\text{TIME}[t_3] = \text{TIME}[t_4] = 16$ . The triangles are ordered ascending according to  $\text{TIME}$  where ties are broken according to the internal angle at the head of the discovering edge. E.g.,  $t_3$  is before  $t_4$  since  $\|\angle zsc\| = 2 < 4 = \|\angle zsy\|$ .

the unique directed cycle  $\langle e_1, \dots, e_k, b \rangle$  consisting of  $b$  and tree edges  $e_1, \dots, e_k$  the *fundamental cycle*  $C(b)$  of  $b$ . During the first DFS, we collect the following additional information. The *depth*  $\text{DEPTH}(v)$  of a vertex  $v$  is the length of the unique  $r$ - $v$ -path along tree edges. The *lowpoint* of a back edge  $b = (v, w)$  is  $\text{LOWPT}(b) = \text{DEPTH}(w)$ . Let  $(p, w)$  be the parent edge of  $w$  and let  $(w, c)$  be the first edge on  $C(b)$ ; the *angle* of  $b$  is  $\text{ANGLE}(b) = \|\angle vwc\|$  if the edges to  $p, v, c$  appear in this order in the CCW incidence list of  $w$ , otherwise it is  $\|\angle cww\|$ . In the former case we call  $b$  a *left* back edge (i.e.,  $C(b)$  is a clockwise cycle), in the latter a *right* back edge. An *outermost return edge* of an edge  $e$  is a back edge  $b$  for which  $e \in C(b)$  and that maximizes  $(-\text{LOWPT}(b), \text{ANGLE}(b))$  – sorted lexicographically, i.e., a back edge with maximum angle among all back edges  $b$  with minimum lowpoint among those fulfilling  $e \in C(b)$ . A tree edge  $e$  inherits its lowpoint and angle from its outermost return edges. This concludes the first DFS.

In Fig. 3a, for example,  $(z, y)$  is a right back edge because  $s, c, z$  is the CCW order of the three neighbors at  $y$ . We have  $\text{PARENTEDGE}(c) = (y, c)$ ,

$\text{LOWPT}(c, x) = \text{DEPTH}(r) = 0$ , and  $\text{ANGLE}(c, x) = \|\angle srz\| = 3$ . Thus  $(z, r)$  is the only outermost return edge of the tree edge  $(c, x)$  and further  $\text{LOWPT}(c, a) = 1$  and  $\text{ANGLE}(c, a) = 1$  while  $\text{LOWPT}(c, s) = 1$  and  $\text{ANGLE}(c, s) = 2$ .

Before the second DFS, we sort the outgoing edges  $e$  of each vertex lexicographically by  $(-\text{LOWPT}(e), \text{ANGLE}(e))$ . E.g., among the outgoing edges of  $b$  in Fig. 3a,  $(c, a)$  is before  $(c, s)$  due to its smaller angle and  $(c, s)$  is before  $(c, x)$  due to its greater lowpoint. Now we perform the second DFS following this order of edges. Observe that this still yields the same orientation and partition of the edges into tree and back edges as in the first DFS; only the order in which the subtrees are traversed may be different. During this second traversal of the graph, we take note of the order in which the separating triangles are discovered. For this purpose we consider a separating triangle to be discovered once all three of its edges have been traversed. If several separating triangles  $t_1, \dots, t_k$  are discovered at the same time, they share an edge  $(v, w)$  traversed from  $v$  to  $w$  and have distinct third vertices  $u_1, \dots, u_k$ . Moreover, the shared edge  $(v, w)$  is the edge of  $t_1, \dots, t_k$  that was discovered last. Let the *internal angle* of  $t_i$  be the angle at  $w$  inside  $t_i$ ; its size is  $\|\angle vwu_i\|$  if  $(v, w)$  is a left back edge, and  $\|\angle u_iwv\|$  otherwise. Now we order  $t_1, \dots, t_k$  by the size of their internal angle in increasing order. We now have an ordering of all separating triangles. We set the *reference edge* of triangle  $t_i$  to be  $(v, w)$  if the third traversed edge  $(v, w)$  of  $t_i$  is a right back edge and  $(w, v)$  otherwise. In Fig. 3a,  $(z, s)$  is the last edge of the separating triangle  $t = \langle z, b, s \rangle$  that is traversed. Since  $(z, s)$  is a left back edge it follows that the reference edge of  $t$  is  $(s, z)$ . The size of the internal angle of  $t$  is  $\|\angle zsc\| = 2$ .

**Theorem 1.** *The algorithm described above orders the separating triangles of  $G$  correctly from innermost to outermost in linear time.*

*Proof.* Consider the point in time during the second DFS when we traverse the last edge  $(v, w)$  of a separating triangle  $t = \langle u, v, w \rangle$ .

*The vertices  $u, v$  and  $w$  lie on a single directed tree path  $P$  from  $w$  to either  $u$  or  $v$ :* Since  $(v, w)$  closes a cycle, it must be a back edge, implying  $\text{DEPTH}(w) < \text{DEPTH}(v)$ . If  $\{u, v\}$  is a tree edge, then  $|\text{DEPTH}(u) - \text{DEPTH}(v)| = 1$ , and  $u \neq w$  implies  $\text{DEPTH}(w) < \text{DEPTH}(u)$ . If  $\{u, v\}$  is the back edge  $(u, v)$ , we have  $\text{DEPTH}(w) < \text{DEPTH}(v) < \text{DEPTH}(u)$ . And if  $\{u, v\}$  is the back edge  $(v, u)$ , we know that  $\text{LOWPT}(v, u) > \text{LOWPT}(v, w)$  because it was traversed earlier. Thus  $\text{DEPTH}(w) < \text{DEPTH}(u)$  follows in all three cases, which means that  $u$  and  $v$  are contained in the subtree rooted at  $w$ . Since  $u$  and  $v$  are also connected by an edge, it follows that there is a directed tree path  $P$  from  $w$  to one of  $u$  or  $v$ , whichever is deeper, such that all three vertices of  $t$  lie on  $P$ .

*All separating triangles that are discovered with the edge  $(v, w)$  lie to the right (left, resp.) of  $(v, w)$  if  $(v, w)$  is a left (right, resp.) back edge:* (This implies that our calculation of the sizes of the internal angles as well as the reference edge are correct.) W.l.o.g. assume for contradiction that  $(v, w)$  is a left back edge and






Fig. 4: Illustrations for the proof of Theorem 1. Dotted lines represent paths of length  $\geq 0$ . In (a) and (b), the edge  $(v, w)$  is the last edge of triangle  $t = \langle u, v, w \rangle$  we traverse.

$t$  lies to the left of  $(v, w)$ . We have already shown that  $\text{DEPTH}(w) < \text{DEPTH}(u)$ . Assume first that  $\text{DEPTH}(v) < \text{DEPTH}(u)$ ; see Fig. 4a. Let  $x$  be the successor of  $v$  on  $P$ . It is clear that either  $\text{LOWPT}(v, x) < \text{DEPTH}(w) = \text{LOWPT}(v, w)$  or  $\text{LOWPT}(v, x) = \text{DEPTH}(w)$  and  $\text{ANGLE}(v, x) \geq \text{ANGLE}(u, w) > \text{ANGLE}(v, w)$ . Therefore we traverse  $(v, w)$  before  $(v, x)$  and consequently also  $(u, w)$  during the second DFS, a contradiction to the assumption that we discover  $t$  when we traverse  $(v, w)$ . The other case  $\text{DEPTH}(u) < \text{DEPTH}(v)$  is depicted in Fig. 4b. Let  $x$  be the successor of  $u$  on  $P$ . In this case we have  $\text{LOWPT}(u, x) = \text{DEPTH}(w) = \text{LOWPT}(u, w)$  and  $\text{ANGLE}(u, x) < \text{ANGLE}(u, w)$  because otherwise an edge would cross  $C(u, w)$ . Therefore we traverse  $(u, w)$  after  $(u, x)$  and consequently also  $(v, w)$  during the second DFS, again a contradiction to the assumption that we discover  $t$  when we traverse  $(v, w)$ .

*All edges contained in the interior of  $t$  are traversed before  $(v, w)$ :* Let  $e$  be an edge in the interior of  $t$ . If  $e$  lies on  $P$ , then  $e$  is certainly traversed before  $(v, w)$ ; recall that  $(v, w)$  is the last edge of  $t$  that is traversed and thus,  $u$  and all edges on  $P$  have to be traversed before traversing  $(v, w)$ . Otherwise the edge  $e$  lies in the interior of at least one of the fundamental cycles  $C(b)$ ,  $b \in \{(v, w), (u, w), (v, u), (u, v)\}$  – where the latter three only have to be considered if they are back edges. Let  $x$  be the deepest ancestor of the tail of  $e$  on  $P$  and let  $z$  be the successor of  $x$  on  $C(b)$ . If  $x$  is the tail of  $e$ , let  $e = (x, y)$ . Otherwise let  $y$  be the child of  $x$  on the tree path to the head of  $e$ . See Fig. 4c. Since  $(x, y)$  is in the interior of the fundamental cycle  $C(b)$ , it follows that the outermost return edge of  $(x, y)$  is also in the interior of  $C(b)$ . Thus  $(x, y)$  must have a greater lowpoint than  $b$  or an equal lowpoint but a smaller angle. Since  $(x, z)$  is on  $C(b)$ , it follows that the outermost return edge of  $(x, z)$  is  $b$  or it has a lower lowpoint than  $b$  or an equal lowpoint but a greater or equal angle. Hence  $(x, y)$  must be traversed before  $(x, z)$  in the second DFS. This implies that  $e$  was traversed before  $b$ . Since  $(v, w)$  was the last edge traversed among  $(v, w)$ ,  $(u, w)$ , and  $\{u, v\}$ , it follows that  $e$  must be traversed before  $(v, w)$ .

*The order of the triangles is correct:* If a separating triangle  $t'$  lies inside  $t$ , then we either traverse all its edges before  $(v, w)$  or we traverse two of its edges before  $(v, w)$  and the third is  $(v, w)$ . In the former case, we already know that our algorithm orders  $t'$  before  $t$ . In the latter, let  $u'$  be the third vertex of  $t'$ , and w.l.o.g., let  $(v, w)$  be a left back edge.  $u'$  lies inside  $t$ , thus the size  $\|\angle vwu'\|$  of the internal angle of  $t'$  is smaller than the angle  $\|\angle vwu\|$  of  $t$ . We compare  $t$  and  $t'$  by the sizes of their internal angles and order  $t'$  before  $t$ .

*Linear Running Time:* During the first DFS, we do not list the candidates for the outermost return edge of a tree edge  $(v, w)$ , but instead we select it from among the outermost return edges of the outgoing edges of  $w$  when popping  $w$  from the DFS stack. We use LSD-radix sort on two-digit numbers (i) to sort all edges together before the second DFS (first by ascending angle, then stably by descending lowpoint) and (ii) to sort the separating triangles after the second DFS has been completed (first by the size of the internal angle, then stably by the point in time the triangle was discovered during the second DFS). After sorting all edges together before the second DFS, we partition the sorted list by the tail of the edges in order to obtain the ordered lists of outgoing edges per vertex. This way both of the sorting steps run in linear time.

## References

1. Patrizio Angelini, Steven Chaplick, Sabine Cornelsen, and Giordano Da Lozzo. Planar L-drawings of bimodal graphs. *JGAA*, 26(3):307–334, 2022. doi:10.7155/jgaa.00596.
2. Therese Biedl and Martin Derka. The (3,1)-ordering for 4-connected planar triangulations. *JGAA*, 20(2):347–362, 2016. doi:10.7155/jgaa.00396.
3. Therese Biedl, Goos Kant, and Michael Kaufmann. On triangulating planar graphs under the four-connectivity constraint. *Algorithmica*, 19(4):427–446, 1997. doi:10.1007/PL00009182.
4. Therese Biedl and Philipp Kindermann. Finding Tutte paths in linear time. In Christel Baier, Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Paola Flocchini, and Stefano Leonardi, editors, *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP '19*, volume 132 of *LIPICs*, pages 23:1–23:14. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2019.23.
5. Therese Biedl and Claire Pennarun. Non-aligned drawings of planar graphs. *JGAA*, 21(5):915–937, 2017. doi:10.7155/jgaa.00444.
6. Ulrik Brandes. The left-right planarity test. 2009. URL: <https://www.uni-konstanz.de/algo/publications/b-lrpt-sub.pdf>.
7. Norishige Chiba and Takao Nishizeki. Arboricity and subgraph listing algorithms. *SIAM Journal on computing*, 14(1):210–223, 1985. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/0214017>.
8. Markus Chimani, Carsten Gutwenger, Michael Jünger, Gunnar W. Klau, Karsten Klein, and Petra Mutzel. The open graph drawing framework (OGDF). In Roberto Tamassia, editor, *Handbook on Graph Drawing and Visualization*, chapter 17, pages 543–569. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2013. URL: <https://cs.brown.edu/people/rtamassi/gdhandbook/>.

9. Xin He, Jiun-Jie Wang, and Huaming Zhang. Compact visibility representation of 4-connected plane graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 447:62–73, 2012. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2012.02.010.
10. Arkady Kanevsky, Roberto Tamassia, Giuseppe Di Battista, and Jianer Chen. On-line maintenance of the four-connected components of a graph. In *Proceedings 32nd Annual Symposium of Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS '91)*, pages 793–801. IEEE Computer Society, 1991.
11. Goos Kant. A more compact visibility representation. *International Journal of Computational Geometry & Applications*, 07(03):197–210, 1997. doi:10.1142/S0218195997000132.
12. Goos Kant and Xin He. Two algorithms for finding rectangular duals of planar graphs. In Jan van Leeuwen, editor, *WG 1993*, volume 790 of *LNCS*, pages 396–410. Springer, 1994. doi:10.1007/3-540-57899-4\_69.
13. Goossen Kant. *Algorithms for Drawing Planar Graphs*. PhD thesis, Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht, 1993. URL: <https://dspace.library.uu.nl/bitstream/handle/1874/842/full.pdf>.
14. Ignaz Rutter and Alexander Wolff. Computing large matchings fast. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 7(1):1:1–1:21, 2010. doi:10.1145/1868237.1868238.
15. Hassler Whitney. A theorem on graphs. *Annals of Mathematics*, 32(2):378–390, 1931. doi:10.2307/1968197.

## Appendix: Pseudocode

In this appendix we provide pseudocode for Step 2 of our algorithm, i.e., for ordering the separating triangles from innermost to outermost. Observe that global variables are in small caps, local variables are single letters set in italics; uninitialized values are considered to be set to  $\perp$ .

---

### Algorithm 1: Order separating triangles

---

**Input:** Graph  $G = (V, E)$ , list  $T$  of separating triangles, vertex  $r$  on outer face  
**Output:** Order TRIANGLEORDER of separating triangles  
 DEPTH[ $r$ ]  $\leftarrow$  0  
 PARENTEGE[ $r$ ]  $\leftarrow$  virtual edge in outer face  
 DFS1( $r$ )  
 SortEdges  
 NOW  $\leftarrow$  0  
 DFS2( $r$ )  
 SortTriangles

---



---

### Procedure DFS1(vertex $v$ )

---

```

 $e \leftarrow$  PARENTEGE[ $v$ ]
while there exists some non-oriented  $\{v, w\} \in E$  do
  orient  $\{v, w\}$  as  $(v, w)$ 
  if DEPTH[ $w$ ] =  $\perp$  then // tree edge
    PARENTEGE[ $w$ ]  $\leftarrow$   $(v, w)$ 
    DEPTH[ $w$ ]  $\leftarrow$  DEPTH[ $v$ ] + 1
    ACTIVECHILD[ $v$ ]  $\leftarrow$   $w$ 
    DFS1( $w$ )
  else // back edge
     $(p, w) \leftarrow$  PARENTEGE[ $w$ ]
     $c \leftarrow$  ACTIVECHILD[ $w$ ] // successor of  $w$  on  $C(v, w)$ 
    LOWPT[ $(v, w)$ ]  $\leftarrow$  DEPTH[ $w$ ]
    if  $\|\angle vwc\| < \|\angle pwc\|$  then
       $(v, w)$  is a left back edge
      ANGLE[ $(v, w)$ ]  $\leftarrow$   $\|\angle vwc\|$ 
    else
       $(v, w)$  is a right back edge
      ANGLE[ $(v, w)$ ]  $\leftarrow$   $\|\angle c w v\|$ 
    OUTERMOSTRETURNEDGE[ $(v, w)$ ]  $\leftarrow$   $(v, w)$ 
  ▼ update outermost return edge of parent edge
   $o \leftarrow$  OUTERMOSTRETURNEDGE[ $e$ ]
   $o' \leftarrow$  OUTERMOSTRETURNEDGE[ $(v, w)$ ]
  if  $o = \perp \vee (-\text{LOWPT}[o'], \text{ANGLE}[o']) > (-\text{LOWPT}[o], \text{ANGLE}[o])$  then
    OUTERMOSTRETURNEDGE[ $e$ ]  $\leftarrow$   $o'$ 
  ▼ parent edge inherits from its outermost return edge
  LOWPT[ $e$ ]  $\leftarrow$  LOWPT[OUTERMOSTRETURNEDGE[ $e$ ]]
  ANGLE[ $e$ ]  $\leftarrow$  ANGLE[OUTERMOSTRETURNEDGE[ $e$ ]]

```

---

---

**Procedure** SortEdges

---

```

 $A \leftarrow \text{CountingSort}(E, e \mapsto \text{ANGLE}[e])$ 
 $L \leftarrow \text{CountingSort}(A, e \mapsto |V| - \text{LOWPT}[e])$ 
for  $(v, w) \in L$  do
  |  $\text{append}(\text{EDGEORDER}[v], (v, w))$ 

```

---



---

**Procedure** DFS2(vertex  $v$ )

---

```

for  $(v, w) \in \text{EDGEORDER}[v]$  do
  |  $\text{EDGETIME}[(v, w)] \leftarrow \text{NOW}$ 
  |  $\text{NOW} \leftarrow \text{NOW} + 1$ 
  | if  $\text{DEPTH}[v] + 1 = \text{DEPTH}[w]$  then // tree edge
    | |  $\text{DFS2}(w)$ 

```

---



---

**Procedure** SortTriangles

---

```

for  $t \in T$  do
  |  $(v, w) \leftarrow \arg \max_{\text{edge } e \in t} \text{EDGETIME}[e]$ 
  |  $u \leftarrow \text{third vertex on } t$ 
  |  $\text{TIME}[t] \leftarrow \text{EDGETIME}[(v, w)]$ 
  | if  $(v, w)$  is a left back edge then
    | |  $\text{REFERENCEEDGE}[t] \leftarrow (w, v)$ 
    | |  $\text{INTERNALANGLE}[t] \leftarrow \|\angle vwu\|$ 
  | else
    | |  $\text{REFERENCEEDGE}[t] \leftarrow (v, w)$ 
    | |  $\text{INTERNALANGLE}[t] \leftarrow \|\angle uvw\|$ 
  |
 $A \leftarrow \text{CountingSort}(T, t \mapsto \text{INTERNALANGLE}[t])$ 
 $\text{TRIANGLEORDER} \leftarrow \text{CountingSort}(A, t \mapsto \text{TIME}[t])$ 

```

---