



Crossing Number is NP-hard for Constant Path-width (and Tree-width)

Petr Hliněný ✉ 

Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

Liana Khazaliya ✉ 

Technische Universität Wien, Vienna, Austria

Abstract

CROSSING NUMBER is a celebrated problem in graph drawing. It is known to be NP-complete since 1980s, and fairly involved techniques were already required to show its fixed-parameter tractability when parameterized by the vertex cover number. In this paper we prove that computing exactly the crossing number is NP-hard even for graphs of path-width 12 (and as a result, even of tree-width 9).

Thus, while tree-width and path-width have been very successful tools in many graph algorithm scenarios, our result shows that general crossing number computations unlikely (under $P \neq NP$) could be successfully tackled using bounded width of graph decompositions, which has been a '*tantalizing open problem*' [S. Cabello, Hardness of Approximation for Crossing Number, 2013] till now.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Mathematics of computing → Graph theory; Theory of computation → Computational geometry

Keywords and phrases Graph Drawing, Crossing Number, Tree-width, Path-width

1 Introduction

The notion of a crossing number originally arose during WWII by Turán [16] for completed bipartite graphs in the context of the minimization of the number of crossings between tracks connecting brick kilns to storage sites. Formally, the *crossing number* $cr(G)$ of a graph G is the minimum number of pairwise edge crossings in a drawing of G in the plane. Determining the crossing number of a graph is one of the most prominent combinatorial optimization problems in graph theory.

Back then in 1980s, Garey and Johnson [8] showed that the following optimization problem is NP-hard. However, their result has been extended even to fairly restrictive graph classes, in particular the problem is NP-hard even for cubic graphs [10], and also for a fixed rotation scheme [14]. Moreover, CROSSING NUMBER is APX-hard [2] (does not admit a PTAS unless $P = NP$) in its general setting.

Another direction of the long-going research is on computation of the crossing number for graphs that are initially close to planar graphs. Surprisingly, CROSSING NUMBER remains NP-hard for almost planar graphs (graphs that can be made planar and hence crossing-free by the removal of just a single edge) [3], and remains NP-hard on almost planar graphs even when only 3 vertices are of degree greater than 3 [11, 12]. This means that with respect to the maximum degree of the graph, as well as with respect to the number of edges to remove from the graph to make it planar, CROSSING NUMBER is para-NP-hard.

One more way to deal with the hardness of CROSSING NUMBER, is exploiting the structure of the input to get understanding how it affects the computational feasibility of the problem. From this side, if the input graph has a vertex cover of bounded size, then the crossing number can be computed exactly in FPT-time (some function of the parameter, i.e. vertex cover number, multiplied by polynomial of the input size) [13]. Thus, elucidating CROSSING NUMBER when other structural parameters (in particular parameters bounded by the vertex cover number, such as the feedback vertex set number, tree-depth, path-width and tree-width) not once was mentioned as an interesting research venue to explore [1, 2, 17]. In this direction,

it is known that the problem is solvable in linear time on maximal graphs of path-width 3, admits a 2-approximation algorithm on (general) graphs of path-width 3, and admits a $4w^3$ -approximation on maximal graphs of path-width w [1]. For more involved overview of the results on CROSSING NUMBER, we refer the reader to a recent survey by Zehavi [17].

In this paper, we present a hardness result: CROSSING NUMBER is NP-hard even on a graphs of constant path-width (and, respectively, tree-width), namely, for path-width 12 (and tree-width 9). That also immediately closes the question if CROSSING NUMBER is FPT or XP on aforementioned graph classes, since our result shows that the problem is para-NP-hard.

► **Theorem 1.1** (cf. Theorem 3.1). *The problem to decide whether a graph G can be drawn with at most k crossings, for G and k on the input, is NP-complete even when G is required to be of path-width at most 12 and of tree-width at most 9.*

In Section 2 we define the basic concepts, i.e., of a drawing, the crossing number, width decompositions, and the problem itself. In Section 3 we describe a hardness reduction from SAT. Since the proof is rather technical, in separate subsections, we propose the construction (in Section 3.3), necessary conditions for an existence of a drawings with some predefined crossing number (see in Section 3.4), correctness of the reduction (see in Section 3.5), and, lastly, that the width parameters, i.e. path-width and tree-width, of the graphs constructed by our reduction are constant (see in Section 3.6). We conclude in Section 4.

2 Preliminaries

We begin with the standard terminology of graph theory [7], including the notions of tree-width and path-width [5] which are commonly used parameters to capture the complexity of a graph, and of graph drawing concepts [6].

2.1 Drawings

We will consider finite graphs with possible parallel edges throughout the paper. A *drawing* \mathcal{G} of a graph G in the plane is a mapping of the vertices $V(G)$ to distinct points in the plane, and of the edges $E(G)$ to simple curves connecting their respective endpoints but not containing any other vertex point. When convenient, we will refer to the elements (vertices and edges) of the drawing as to the corresponding elements of G . A *crossing* is the intersection (a common point) of two distinct edge curves, other than their common endpoint. It is well established that the search for an optimal solution to the crossing number problem can be restricted to so called *good drawings*: any pair of edges crosses at most once, adjacent edges do not cross, and there is no crossing point in common of three or more edges.

A drawing \mathcal{G} is *planar* (or a *plane graph*) if \mathcal{G} has no crossings, and a graph is *planar* if it has a planar drawing. The number of crossings in a particular drawing \mathcal{G} is denoted by $\text{cr}(\mathcal{G})$ and the minimum over all good drawings \mathcal{G} of a graph G by $\text{cr}(G)$. We call $\text{cr}(\Gamma_G)$ and $\text{cr}(G)$ the *crossing number* of the drawing Γ_G and the graph G , respectively. The CROSSING NUMBER problem for a given graph G asks for a good drawing \mathcal{G} with the least possible number of crossings.

We will also use a common artifice in crossing number research. In a *weighted* graph, each edge is assigned a positive number (the *weight* or thickness of the edge, usually an integer). Now the *weighted crossing number* is defined as the ordinary crossing number, but a crossing between edges e_1 and e_2 , say of weights t_1 and t_2 , contributes the product $t_1 \cdot t_2$ to the weighted crossing number. For the purpose of computing the crossing number, an edge of integer weight t can be equivalently replaced by a bunch of t parallel edges of weights 1;

this is since we can easily redraw every edge of the bunch tightly along the “cheapest” edge of the bunch. Hence, from now on, we will use weighted edges instead of parallel edges, and shortly say *crossing number* to the weighted crossing number.

2.2 Tree-width and Path-width

A *tree decomposition* \mathcal{T} of an undirected graph G is a pair (T, χ) , where T is a tree (whose vertices we call *nodes*) rooted at a node r and χ is a function that assigns to each node $t \in \mathcal{T}$ a set $\chi(t) \subseteq V(G)$ such that the following holds:

- For every $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$ there is a node t such that $u, v \in \chi(t)$.
- For every vertex $v \in V(G)$, the set of nodes t satisfying $v \in \chi(t)$ forms a nonempty subtree of T .

The sets $\chi(t)$, for $t \in V(T)$, are called *bags* of the tree decomposition. The *width* of a tree decomposition (T, χ) is the size of a largest set $\chi(t)$ minus 1, and the *tree-width* of the graph G , denoted $\text{tw}(G)$, is the minimum width of a tree decomposition of G .

The path decomposition and path-width are defined analogously with the only difference that the tree T is required to be a path.

We are going to use the following cops-and-robber game characterization on the graph G .

- The *robber* player can freely move along cop-free paths in the graph.
- The *cops* fly in a helicopter; can land on a vertex or be lifted back (up). When the helicopter shows above a vertex v , the robber has time to escape wherever (s)he chooses to.
- The robber is caught whenever a cop lands on robber’s vertex v and all neighbors of v in the graph are already occupied by cops.

Such a game is called *monotone* if the robber never gets a chance to reach a vertex previously occupied by a cop.

By [15], the tree-width of G is then at most t if and only if $t + 1$ cops can always catch the robber in G in a monotone game if the robber is visible (to the cop player). The path-width of G is at most t if and only if $t + 1$ cops can always catch the robber in G in a monotone game if the robber is *not* visible to the cops.

3 Hardness Reduction

In this section, we present and prove a polynomial time reduction that given an instance $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ of SATISFABILITY, constructs an equivalent instance (G, k) of CROSSING NUMBER on a graph of constant path-width (and tree-width).

SATISFABILITY

Input: A set of clauses $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \dots, C_\ell\}$ over variables $\mathcal{V} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$

Question: Does there exist an assignment of the variables $\tau : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$ satisfying all clauses in \mathcal{C} ?

CROSSING NUMBER

Input: A simple graph G , $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$

Question: Does G admit a drawing \mathcal{G} in the plane such that \mathcal{G} has at most k crossings?

► **Theorem 3.1.** *There is a polynomial-time algorithm that, given an instance \mathcal{I} of SATISFABILITY, outputs an equivalent instance of CROSSING NUMBER at most k on a graph G of path-width at most 12 and tree-width at most 9, with the parameter k bounded by a polynomial in $|\mathcal{I}|$.*

We note in passing that the resulting graph G of Theorem 3.1 may and typically will contain parallel edges (cf. the treatment of weighted edges), but these can easily be avoided by subdividing each parallel one, at the expense of raising the path-width of G by at most 1.

3.1 High-level Idea

Naturally, for interpreting a SATISFABILITY instance in an instance (G, k) of CROSSING NUMBER, one would use a large “grid structure”, but that is impossible directly in the graph G due to our aim to get a constant tree-width. We are instead going to build a graph G with many small separators (of size $4 + 4$) — which are moreover “linearly ordered” (to achieve constant path-width), such that at each 4-tuple of such a separator, the left side of it is *forced to cross* with the other side in many places (see Figure 3 for a brief illustration). This way we enforce the sought large grid structure in any optimal drawing of G .

At the same time, G is constructed such that there is certain drawing flexibility (“flips”) possible for some of the separated parts, and this flexibility will be used to encode the truth values of variables in SATISFABILITY. A satisfying assignment of the variables will then be checked as a possibility to draw added global clause edges (one per each clause) with minimum crossing cost across the whole picture, which is an idea similar to the one used in [3]. The crucial point of the construction, however, is how to enforce the unique right crossing pattern between the sides of the small separators in G , and for this we build upon an idea originally introduced in [12] and now detailed within Section 3.4.

3.2 Auxiliary Graphs

To facilitate the presentation, we use colors, i.e. heavy-brown (HB), light-black (LB), red (R), blue (B), cyan (C), green (G), to encode the future order of the weights of the corresponding edges (see in Table 1). The weights of the edges will play a crucial role in the future description of possible drawings of the constructing graph. The weight values are assigned with respect to a sufficiently large (still polynomial in $|\mathcal{C}| + |\mathcal{V}|$) edge weight ω , e.g., $\omega = |E(G)|^2$. Then, informally, even one crossing of weight ω^{t+1} “outweighs” all crossings of G of weight ω^t .

■ **Table 1**


Color	Usage	Weight
Heavy-brown (HB)	The Frame and Variable Gadgets attachments	ω^8
Light-black (LB)	Variable Gadgets interior skeletons	ω^6
Red (R)	Paths in Variable Gadgets (vertical)	$\omega^4 + \Theta_{n,\ell}(\omega^1)$
(R')	Stairs interconnecting Variable Gadgets (horizontal)	ω^3
Blue (B)	Paths in Variable Gadgets (vertical)	$\omega^4 + \Theta_{n,\ell}(\omega^1)$
(B')	Stairs connecting within Variable Gadgets (horizontal)	ω^3
Cyan (C)	Clauses Encoding within Variable Gadgets	ω^2
Green (G)	(Global) Clause Edges	$\omega^0 = 1$

Further, we present auxiliary graphs for use as building blocks (Figure 1), before describing the whole construction of the crossing number instance G .

Variable Gadgets. First, for each $i \in [n]$, we construct a *Variable Gadget* Var^i of height $h \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ (see an example of Var^i for $h = 4$ in Figure 1a).

- First, we introduce the vertex set of Var^i as

$$V(\text{Var}^i) = \{b_{j,P}^i, b_{j,N}^i, v_{j,P}^i, v_{j,N}^i\}_{j \in [h+2]} \cup \{r_{j,L}^i, r_{j,R}^i\}_{j \in [h+3]} \cup \{w_0^i, u_0^i, w_1^i, u_1^i\}.$$



(a) The Variable Gadget Var^i , $h = 4$ (b) The Frame with n Variable Gadgets for $n = 3$, $h = 4$

■ **Figure 1** Auxiliary Graphs.

- We add 6 paths as follows:
 - two B-paths (constructed on B-edges) go through vertices $\{b_{j,P}^i\}_{j \in [h+2]}$ and $\{b_{j,N}^i\}_{j \in [h+2]}$, and we will refer to the paths as B-pos and B-neg respectively;
 - two LB-paths go through vertices $\{v_{j,P}^i\}_{j \in [h+2]}$ (LB-pos) and $\{v_{j,N}^i\}_{j \in [h+2]}$ (LB-neg);
 - two R-paths go through vertices $\{r_{j,L}^i\}_{j \in [h+3]}$ (R-left) and $\{r_{j,R}^i\}_{j \in [h+3]}$ (R-right).
- We make these paths adjacent (with HB-edges) to the vertices $w_0^i, u_0^i, w_1^i, u_1^i$ as follows:
 - both B-pos and B-neg paths by their corner vertices to w_0^i and u_0^i ;
 - both LB-pos and LB-neg, analogously, to w_1^i and u_1^i ; and
 - both R-left and R-right paths to both w_0^i, u_0^i and w_1^i, u_1^i (see Figure 1a).
- At the end, for each $j \in [2, h+1]$, we add *stairs* between pairs of -pos and -neg paths, i.e., pairwise connecting B-/LB-pos and B-/LB-neg paths with B'-edges $b_{j,P}^i v_{j,P}^i$ and $b_{j,N}^i v_{j,N}^i$.
- The *weight* of each edge of Var^i is as specified in Table 1; in particular, for the R-paths, the weight of the edges $r_{j,L}^i r_{j+1,L}^i$ and $r_{j,R}^i r_{j+1,R}^i$ is exactly $\omega^4 + j(j+1)\omega$, and for the B-paths, the weight of the edges $b_{j,P}^i b_{j+1,P}^i$ and $b_{j,N}^i b_{j+1,N}^i$ is exactly $\omega^4 + j(j+2)\omega$.

The Frame. We construct the *Frame* for n Variable Gadgets of height h , where $n, h \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

- First, we introduce the HB-cycle (with HB-edges) on 4 vertices u^{BL} (bottom-left), u^{TL} (top-left), u^{TR} (top-right), u^{BR} (bottom-right) in the specified order.
 - Then, we subdivide (n times) the edge between u^{BL} and u^{BR} by adding vertices $\{x_0^i\}_{i \in [n]}$; analogously we subdivide the edge between u^{TL} and u^{TR} by adding $\{x_1^i\}_{i \in [n]}$.
 - Further, we add another HB-edge between u^{BL} and u^{TL} (resp., between u^{TR} and u^{BR}) and subdivide it h times by adding vertices $\{r_{j,R}^0\}_{j \in [2, h+2]}$ (resp., by adding $\{r_{j,L}^{n+1}\}_{j \in [2, h+2]}$).
- We call the resulting graph of this construction (see Figure 1b) the *Frame F*.

Now, we attach n Variable Gadgets to the Frame F .

- For each $i \in [n]$, we introduce a Variable Gadget Var^i (as described in Section 3.2) and pairwise identify vertices u_0^i, w_0^i of Var^i with vertices x_0^i, x_1^i of the Frame respectively.
- At the end, we add *stairs* (interconnections) between R-paths of the neighboring Variable Gadgets and the Frame, i.e. for each $i \in [n+1]$ and $j \in [2, h+2]$, we add R'-edge $r_{j,R}^{i-1} r_{j,L}^i$.

Thus, for each $i \in [n + 1]$, we make stairs between the R-right path of Var^{i-1} (or, if $i = n + 1$, with a subdivision of the Frame's side $u^{TR}u^{BR}$) and the R-left path of Var^i (or, if $i = 1$, with a subdivision of the Frame's side $u^{TL}u^{BL}$).

The weights of all new edges are again as specified in Table 1.


This finishes the construction of the Frame G' (see G' for $h = 4$, $n = 3$ in Figure 1b). Note that G' still lacks the clause edges and an interpretation of variable occurrences in clauses (the cells of further Figure 2).

So far, for simplicity, we allow ourselves to refer to Figure 1b to illustrate the constructed graph G' . Observe the natural meaning the R-left and R-right paths in each gadget Var^i ; in order to facilitate their connections to Var^{i-1} and to Var^{i+1} , R-left is naturally drawn to the left of R-right. On the other hand, the B-/LB-pos and B-/LB-neg paths of Var^i are symmetric and not adjacent outside of Var^i , and hence they can be flexibly drawn – B-/LB-pos to the left or to the right of B-/LB-neg; this is what will later define the truth value of the variable represented by Var^i .

3.3 The Full Reduction

Consider an instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ of SAT (let $|\mathcal{C}| = \ell$, $|\mathcal{V}| = n$). We construct an instance (G, k) of the CROSSING NUMBER as follows. See Figure 3 for a schematic representation.

- First, we introduce G' , the Frame for n Variable Gadgets of height $h = 4\ell + n - 2$.
- Then, for each $i \in [n]$, we encode the occurrence of the variable x_i in clauses \mathcal{C} . For that purpose, for each $j \in [\ell]$, we add, what we will call, a *cell* between LB-pos and LB-neg paths of the existing variable gadget Var^i . Each cell is defined by two horizontal LB-edges and 3 edges inside, depending on the type (pos, neg, neut) of the cell: pos if $x \in C$; neg if $\bar{x} \in C$; neut if neither x nor \bar{x} is in C . Cell of each type is shown on Figure 2. Cells inside the same Var^i -gadget are separated with additional LB-edges as shown in Figure 3.



■ **Figure 2** Cell types; for cases of variable x occurrence in clause C .

To put it all formally, we start with LB-edges (again, all weights are as specified in Table 1) inside Var -gadgets which separate cells. For each $i \in [n]$, we add

- an LB-path from $v_{1,N}^i$ to $v_{1+i,P}^i$ (below all cells of this Var^i -gadget), precisely on vertices $v_{1,N}^i, v_{2,P}^i, v_{2,N}^i, \dots, v_{i,N}^i, v_{1+i,P}^i$ in this order;
- another LB-path from $v_{4\ell+i-1,N}^i$ to $v_{h+2,P}^i$ (above all cells in Var^i), precisely on vertices $v_{4\ell+i-1,N}^i, v_{4\ell+i,P}^i, v_{4\ell+i,N}^i, \dots, v_{h+1,N}^i, v_{h+2,P}^i$; and
- for each $j \in [\ell - 1]$, a LB-path on vertices $v_{4j+i-1,N}^i, v_{4j+i,P}^i, v_{4j+i,N}^i, v_{4j+i+1,P}^i$ (between cells number j and $j + 1$).

After that, we add cells themselves in the bottom-up order. For all $j \in [\ell]$, we introduce two LB-edges $v_{4j+i-3,P}^i v_{4j+i-3,N}^i$ and $v_{4j+i-1,P}^i v_{4j+i-1,N}^i$, and then we proceed with encoding of our SAT instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ it the following way:

- if $x_i \in C_j$, we introduce a C_{pos} cell (Figure 2a), i.e. we add three C-edges as a path through $v_{4j+i-3,P}^i, v_{4j+i-2,N}^i, v_{4j+i-2,P}^i, v_{4j+i-1,N}^i$;
- in case $\bar{x}_i \in C_j$, we introduce a C_{neg} cell (Figure 2b), i.e. we add three C-edges as a path through $v_{4j+i-3,N}^i, v_{4j+i-2,P}^i, v_{4j+i-2,N}^i, v_{4j+i-1,P}^i$;

- lastly, if neither x_i nor \bar{x}_i is in C_j , we introduce a C_{neut} cell (Figure 2c), formed by one LB-edge $v_{4j+i-2,P}^i v_{4j+i-2,N}^i$ and two C-edges $v_{4j+i-3,P}^i v_{4j+i-2,N}^i$ and $v_{4j+i-2,N}^i v_{4j+i-1,P}^i$.
- At the end, for each $j \in [\ell]$, we add a G-edge that corresponds to the clause C_j itself. Here, we subdivide two vertical HB-edges of the Frame and connect these newly added vertices. Precisely, for each $j \in [\ell]$, we subdivide the edge between $r_{4j-2,R}^0, r_{4j-1,R}^0$ (on the left vertical side $u^{BL}u^{TL}$ of the Frame, cf. Figure 1b) and the edge between $r_{4j+n-1,L}^{n+1}, r_{4j+n,L}^{n+1}$ (on the right vertical side $u^{BR}u^{TR}$). Note the shift in the indices of the subdivided edges, up by $n+1$ from left to right.

This concludes the construction of G .

The reduction returns (G, k) as an instance of CROSSING NUMBER where, for $h = 4\ell + n - 2$,

$$k = 2n(2h+1)\omega^7 + 2n\ell\omega^6 + 4n\ell\omega^4 + 2n \sum_{j=2}^{h+1} j(j+1)\omega^4 + 2n \sum_{j=1}^{h+1} j(j+2)\omega^4 + n\ell\omega^2 + (\omega^2 - 1).$$

3.4 Drawings Claims

Until this point, all Figures were provided as an illustration without arguing, why a certain drawing of the corresponding graph was selected. This Subsection is dedicated to shed light on the conditions that necessarily have to be satisfied for a drawing \mathcal{G} of the previously constructed instance (G, k) of the CROSSING NUMBER unless \mathcal{G} is not a solution.

So, we are considering the constructed instance (G, k) of CROSSING NUMBER from Section 3.3. Following the way the graph G was introduced, we begin to formulate observations and claims that every drawing of the graph with at most k crossings has to satisfy. Naturally, we start with conditions for the heaviest edges, for the Frame and Var-gadgets, and after that we argue about the clauses encoding. Due to space restrictions, we defer proofs of the (*)-marked statements to the Appendix.

► **Observation 3.2.** *If there exists a drawing \mathcal{G} of G such that $\text{cr}(\mathcal{G}) \leq k$, then \mathcal{G} has no crossing that involves any of HB-edges.*


Proof. Assume the contrary, then there is at least one crossing that involves an HB-edge. Such a crossing contributes to the $\text{cr}(\mathcal{G})$ at least the weight of one HB-edge. i.e. ω^8 . However, $\omega^8 > k$, which is a contradiction. ◀

► **Observation 3.3.** *Let H is a subgraph of G . If (H, k) is a no-instance of the CROSSING NUMBER, then (G, k) is a no-instance of the CROSSING NUMBER.*


Proof. Assume the contrary, then there is a drawing \mathcal{G} of G such that $\text{cr}(\mathcal{G}) \leq k$. However, by removing all elements of $G \setminus H$ from the \mathcal{G} we reach a drawing \mathcal{H} of H such that $\text{cr}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \text{cr}(\mathcal{G})$, since crossing number can not increase via edge- or vertex-deletion. Thus, we get a solution \mathcal{H} for (H, k) , which is a contradiction. ◀

Based on Observation 3.3, we now show some claims that speak only about a subgraph of G . As before, let G' be the Frame with n Variable Gadgets (Figure 1) of the graph G ; so, we are going to speak about properties which hold regardless of our clauses encoding in G .

► **Claim 3.4.** *If there exists a drawing \mathcal{G}' of G' such that $\text{cr}(\mathcal{G}') \leq k$, then there are no other crossings than crossings between R- or B-edges with R'- or B'-edges in \mathcal{G}' .*



(a) The drawing $\Gamma(G)$ of G that corresponds to the assignment $x_1 = x_2 = \text{True}$, $x_3 = x_4 = x_5 = \text{False}$. Thus, the clause $C_1 = (x_1 \vee \bar{x}_2 \vee x_4 \vee \bar{x}_5)$ is satisfied by the variable x_5 (observe that the G-edge of C_1 makes an extra jump-up in the drawing area of Var^5 to the right, yet crossing only one C-edge there – same as in other gadgets), $C_2 = (\bar{x}_1 \vee \bar{x}_3 \vee x_5)$ satisfied by x_3 and $C_3 = (x_2 \vee x_3 \vee \bar{x}_4)$ satisfied by x_2 .



(b) The drawing $\Gamma'(G)$ of G that corresponds to the assignment $x_1 = x_2 = x_3 = \text{True}$, $x_4 = x_5 = \text{False}$. Thus, the clause $C_1 = (x_1 \vee \bar{x}_2 \vee x_4 \vee \bar{x}_5)$ is satisfied by the variable x_5 and $C_3 = (x_2 \vee x_3 \vee \bar{x}_4)$ satisfied by x_2 , same as in Figure 3a. The only difference is that here the G-edge of the clause $C_2 = (\bar{x}_1 \vee \bar{x}_3 \vee x_5)$ has no way to make the required extra jump-up without crossing more than one C-edge inside some variable gadget (or other heavier edges). Hence, here the G-edge of C_2 makes extra crossing with two C-edges in the drawing area of Var^3 , and this unavoidably leads to $\text{cr}(\Gamma'(G)) > k$.

■ **Figure 3** An example instance of SAT: $\mathcal{V} = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5\}$ and $\mathcal{C} = \{(x_1 \vee \bar{x}_2 \vee x_4 \vee \bar{x}_5), (\bar{x}_1 \vee \bar{x}_3 \vee x_5), (x_2 \vee x_3 \vee \bar{x}_4)\}$, and a reduction to CROSSING NUMBER of the depicted graph G . The two drawings illustrate assignment two assignments of the variables.

Proof. If each edge of the pair of crossing edges has its weight larger than ω^3 , then any such crossing contributes to the $\text{cr}(\mathcal{G}')$ at least $\omega^4 \cdot \omega^4$. But $\omega^8 > k$, which is a contradiction. So, the only possible crossings of \mathcal{G}' involve at least one edge of the weight ω^3 (R'- or B'-edge). However, LB-edges cannot be involved in any crossing of \mathcal{G}' , since even if it is a crossing with an edge of ω^3 , entirely the crossing gives ω^9 , which is already greater than the desired value of k . Thus, in \mathcal{G}' only crossings of R-/B-edges with R'-/B'-edges do not contradict the existence of the solution. ◀

► **Claim 3.5.** *If a drawing \mathcal{G}' of G' is a solution of the instance (G', k) , then, for all $u, v \in V(G' \setminus F)$, both u and v are lying in the same face of the Frame F in \mathcal{G}' , and the selection of such a face is uniquely predetermined.*

Proof. First, let us notice that the graph $G' \setminus F$ is connected. Then, assume the contrary, we have a pair of vertices $u, v \in V(G' \setminus F)$ that are lying on different faces in a drawing that is induced on \mathcal{G}' by the Frame. From connectivity of $G' \setminus F$, there is a crossing with an edge of the Frame. However, all edges of the Frame are HB-edges. Thus, we have a contradiction with Observation 3.2.

Moreover, there is only one such a face that have all $\{r_{j,R}^0, r_{j,L}^{n+1}\}_{j \in [2, h+2]}$ (which are not the part of the Frame, see Definition of it in Section 3.2) on its border. Since $G' \setminus F$ is attached to all $\{r_{j,R}^0, r_{j,L}^{n+1}\}_{j \in [2, h+2]}$ by the construction of G' , again, to avoid any crossing with HB-edges of the Frame, selection of the face of F for all vertices $V(G' \setminus F)$ is uniquely predefined. ◀

Claim 3.5 allows us, without loss of generality, fix a drawing of the Frame F as it is shown in Figure 1b. So, we define an orientation and, as a consequence, positioning of left and right sides. This way, the fixed drawing of the Frame determines a linear order of variable gadgets Var^i (from left to right following increasing order of $i \in [n]$).

Furthermore, we already almost fixed a drawing of Var-gadgets inside the Frame. Still, the fact that we have not enough budget for any other crossing (namely, only crossings between R'- and B'-edges of weight ω^3 has not been covered yet) needs some proper counting that we will provide further. By now, according to Claim 3.4, the R/B/LB-paths of Var-gadgets are not allowed to cross each other in any solution if such a one exists.

Lastly, let us notice that the positioning of the vertical R-paths is also fixed.

► **Claim 3.6.** *If a drawing \mathcal{G}' of G' is a solution of the instance (G', k) , then, for all $i \in [n]$, the R-left path of the Var^i is drawn to the left from both LB-paths of Var^i , while the R-right path is to the right.*

Proof. Assume the contrary, for some $i \in [n]$, R-left path is drawn to the right from both LB-paths of Var^i . However, by the construction (see Section 3.2), R-left path has R'-edges (called a *stair* before) attached which are going to the R-right path of Var^{i-1} (or, for $i = 1$, to a subdivision of the Frame's side $u^{BL}u^{TL}$). So, since LB-paths with HB-edges of Var^i connect top side with the bottom side of the Frame and edges have to stay inside the Frame (pre-selected face by Claim 3.5), they are either cross HB- or LB-edges of Var^i , which gives us a contradiction with Observation 3.2 or Claim 3.4 correspondingly.


Following the same arguments, we get a contradiction for the symmetric assumption that R-right path is drawn to the left from both LB-paths of Var^i . ◀

Now, let us check how crossings of R- and B-edges with R'- and B'-edges behave. Briefly saying, by the following Lemma 3.7, we show that crossings between the R- and B-edges are also predetermined in a way. For this purpose, while constructing the graph G , we played

a bit with additional *adjustment* weight of order ω^1 for the vertical R- and B-edges. This adjustment weight selection forces an alternation of crossings as shown in Figure 1b.

► **Lemma 3.7.** *If a drawing \mathcal{G}' of G' is a solution of the instance (G', k) , then each B-edge (R-edge) crosses exactly one R'-edge (B'-edge). The total weight of all crossings between B(R)- and R' (B')-edges adds $2n \left((2h+1)\omega^7 + \sum_{j=2}^{h+1} j(j+1)\omega^4 + \sum_{j=1}^{h+1} j(j+2)\omega^4 \right)$ to the count $\text{cr}(\mathcal{G}')$.*

Proof. First, we show that the minimum weight of all crossings between R(B)- and B' (R')-edges is achieved when they are alternating. And then, that this minimum is the only possible value that does not exceed the given budget (k) for the total crossing number.



(a) $(2s_1 + g_3)\omega^3 = 3\omega^7 + 18\omega^4$ (b) $(s_1 + g_2 + s_2)\omega^3 = 3\omega^7 + 17\omega^4$ (c) $(g_1 + 2s_2)\omega^3 = 3\omega^7 + 18\omega^4$

■ **Figure 4** Illustration for the proof of Lemma 3.7

Thus, recall that, for all $x \in \{L, R\}$, $\alpha \in [n]$ and

- $j \in [h+2]$, the weight of the edge $r_{j,x}^\alpha r_{j+1,x}^\alpha$ is equal to $\omega^4 + j(j+1)\omega$, let denote $g_j = \omega^4 + j(j+1)\omega$;
- $j \in [h+1]$, the weight of the edge $b_{j,x}^\alpha b_{j+1,x}^\alpha$ is equal to $\omega^4 + j(j+2)\omega$, let denote $s_j = \omega^4 + j(j+2)\omega$.

We are aiming to show that each pair of R- and B-paths and stairs on them gives at least $(2h+1)\omega^7 + \sum_{j=2}^{h+1} j(j+1)\omega^4 + \sum_{j=1}^{h+1} j(j+2)\omega^4$ to the total crossing number.

We propose the most standard proof by induction by h . We start with $h = 1$. Then, there are 3 possible ways for crossings between R- and B-edges. As it is shown in Figure 4, the one with alternating crossings is the only one that gives exactly $3\omega^7 + 17\omega^4$ that matches the desired formula for $h = 1$.

Assume that for some integer $h \geq 1$ such crossings between R- and B-paths and stairs give at least $A := (2h+1)\omega^7 + \sum_{j=2}^{h+1} j(j+1)\omega^4 + \sum_{j=1}^{h+1} j(j+2)\omega^4$. Increase the height h of the Var-gadgets to $h+1$ now. Another pair of horizontal R'- and B'-edges appears in each staircase. Taking into the account the induction assumption, there are only 2 possible relative placements of these new edges within their staircase:

- The new $(h+1)$ -th horizontal R'-edge crosses a lighter B-edge, and then heavier R-edge crosses the new horizontal B'-edge; leading to $A + g_{h+3}\omega^3 + s_{h+1}\omega^3 = A + 2\omega^7 + (h+3)(h+4)\omega^4 + (h+1)(h+3)\omega^4 = A + 2\omega^7 + (2h^2 + 11h + 15)\omega^4$ crossings.
- The new $(h+1)$ -th horizontal R'-edge crosses a heavier B-edge, and then lighter R-edge crosses the new horizontal B'-edge: leading to $A + g_{h+2}\omega^3 + s_{h+2}\omega^3 = A + 2\omega^7 + (h+2)(h+3)\omega^4 + (h+2)(h+4)\omega^4 = A + 2\omega^7 + (2h^2 + 11h + 14)\omega^4$ crossings.

This way, we conclude that such an alternation of crossings as in the second subcase is the only way to achieve the desired value of $(2h+1)\omega^7 + \sum_{j=2}^{h+2} j(j+1)\omega^4 + \sum_{j=1}^{h+1} j(j+2)\omega^4$ per pair of R- and B-path with their stairs formed by R'- and B'-edges.

Together, there are n Var-gadgets in the resulting graph G , and for each Var-gadget we have two pairs of such staircases as described above, one on each side. Thus, we have arrived at the sought statement; for all crossings on the R- and B-paths together we need at least $2n \left((2h+1)\omega^7 + \sum_{j=2}^{h+1} j(j+1)\omega^4 + \sum_{j=1}^{h+1} j(j+2)\omega^4 \right)$ crossings. ◀

Next, we return back to the full reduction graph G , and investigate properties of its admissible drawings.

► **Lemma 3.8.** *If the crossing number of a drawing \mathcal{G} of G does not exceed k , then the G -edges bring along at least $2n\ell\omega^6 + 4n\ell\omega^4 + n\ell\omega^2$ crossings. In particular, every G -edge in \mathcal{G} crosses precisely one C-edge of every Var^i -gadget.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.7, if $\text{cr}(\mathcal{G}) \leq k$, then $2n \left((2h+1)\omega^7 + \sum_{j=2}^{h+1} j(j+1)\omega^4 + \sum_{j=1}^{h+1} j(j+2)\omega^4 \right)$ from our budget of k was already spent to crossings with B- and R-edges. Then, let us consider a single G-edge e and the subgraph G_{HB} of G induced on HB-edges. The edge e has its endpoints in G_{HB} (one endpoint lies on HB-path between u^{TL} and u^{BL} , another—on HB-path between u^{TR} and u^{BR}). Now, we notice that if the edge e does not lie on a single face of G_{HB} then it has a crossing with at least one HB-edge. This gives a contradiction with Observation 3.2. Thus, when we are back to the analysis of possible drawings of the whole graph G , drawing \mathcal{G} of G could be a solution only in case if e goes through all Var-gadgets. It is so, since they are lying in that single face where the edge e supposes to lie to avoid creating crossings with HB-edges.

For every $i \in [n]$, and since no crossing with HB-edges is possible by Observation 3.2, to cross a single Var^i -gadget the edge e has to cross each of its 6 paths B-pos, B-neg, LB-pos, LB-neg, R-left, R-right. These account for at least $2\omega^6 + 4\omega^4 + \Theta_{n,\ell}(\omega^1)$ crossings;

- crossings between both LB-paths of the Var^i -gadget and the G-edge e give the weight $2\omega^6$;
- crossings between both R-paths of the Var^i -gadget and the G-edge e along with crossings between both its B-paths and e give the weight $4\omega^4 + \Theta_{n,\ell}(\omega^1)$, where $\Theta_{n,\ell}(\omega^1) \geq 0$ refers to the sum of (undetermined) adjustment weights on these paths.

Furthermore, there is another path in each Var^i -gadget, edge-disjoint from all previous and made up of LB- and C-edges of the clause cells in Var^i (Figure 3). This path necessarily adds another weight of ω^2 crossings of e with Var^i .

Multiplied by n Var-gadgets and ℓ G-edges in G we get, under the assumptions, altogether at least $2n\ell\omega^6 + 4n\ell\omega^4 + n\ell\omega^2$ crossings on the G-edges of G (which, hence, have not been counted for G' in Lemma 3.7). Considering the total budget of at most k crossings we have got, we see that there is no more than $(\omega^2 - 1)$ crossings left at our disposal, and hence each of the G-edges in G has to cross a C-edge of a clause cell in each Var-gadget (and not an LB-edge of it), and no more than one such C-edge in each Var-gadget, as claimed. ◀

For each G-edge, we define its *cells area* as a connected region (union) of faces in a drawing \mathcal{G} of G as it is shown in Figure 3 with a grey fill, i.e. for each $j \in [\ell]$, there is a single connected horizontal block of faces that includes all cells of the clause C_j and will correspond to the cells area for the G-edge which is j^{th} in bottom-up order. For each such a cells area we furthermore define its *up-* and *down-level* as the subsets of faces that are higher

and lower, respectively, by subscripts of their vertices. To clarify the last point, by the next lemma we show that for each $j \in [\ell]$, if the crossing number of the drawing \mathcal{G} of the graph G does not exceed k , then the j^{th} G -edge does not leave its cells area. Now, we proceed with that formally.

► **Lemma 3.9.** *If the crossing number of a drawing \mathcal{G} of G does not exceed k , then any G -edge cannot be drawn (even partially) outside of its cells area (see Figure 3).*

Proof. By the construction of the graph, for each $j \in [\ell]$, the j^{th} G -edge goes from the subdivision of the edge between $r_{4j-2,R}^0, r_{4j-1,R}^0$ to the subdivision vertex of the edge between $r_{4j+n-1,L}^{n+1}, r_{4j+n,L}^{n+1}$ (segments of the Frame's sides, i.e. $u^{BL}u^{TL}$ and $u^{BR}u^{TR}$, with the shift for $n+1$ closer to u^{TR}).

Then, by Lemma 3.8, each G -edge crosses all Var -gadgets. Thus, for each $j \in [\ell]$, j^{th} G -edge initially starts inside (on down-level) of j^{th} cells area as defined above. Now, let us see that the edge cannot escape cells area which it lies in.

By Lemma 3.8, we have a budget for only 3 pairs of crossings with each of LB-, R- and B-edges plus a single crossing with a C-edge. And also, as it was shown in Lemma 3.8, our budget for crossings with LB-, R- and B-edges is spent for crossing with Var -gadget paths. So, G -edge cannot cross any horizontal B- or R-edge including LB-edges between cells of Var -gadget unless its drawing does not contradict a total crossing number. Based on this insight, there is not a lot of freedom for G -edge left.

- Indeed, assume that G -edge escapes its cells area going higher than an up-level of its cells area. If G -edge is in the up-level, then to escape it has to cross any edge that is on an upper boundary of cells area (recall, it was defined as a union of faces). However, this boundary formed by R-, R'-, B-, B'- and LB-edged, neither of which we can cross without running out of the available budget.
- Then, assume that G -edge escape its cells area going lower than an down-level of its cells area. This case is a bit more involved, since the same argument as above works only for escaping cells area that is in one of Var -gadgets. Indeed, here the lower boundary costs a lot to cross. However, between Var -gadgets there is a way for an edge to greedily go lower. Nevertheless, this also leads to exceeding the budget because of two blocks of LB-edges that separates cells in each Var -gadget. The edge can go lower by reducing for at most 2 from subscripts of edges it crosses, but then it cannot cross Var -gadget because of these LB-edges.

Thus, it has to stay in the same cells area as it was in the beginning, until it reaches its endpoint that is also (by the construction) lies in the same cells area. ◀

3.5 Correctness

Before proceeding with the correctness arguments, let us look back and see that, indeed, all Drawing Claims imply that if some drawing \mathcal{G} of G such that $\text{cr}(\mathcal{G}) \leq k$ exists, then almost all possible crossings are predefined. Practically the only freedom still left is the possibility to *flip* (independently of others) each Var -gadget. By *flips* of the Var -gadget we mean its two possible embeddings, which differ only by the order of B- and LB-paths, e.g. going from left to right in our Figures. As an example, let us consider Figure 3: here, we meet first from left

- either a pair of **-pos** paths and then call such an embedding a *pos-side flip* (see Var^3 -gadget in the middle in Figure 3a);
- or a pair of **-neg** paths and then call such an embedding a *neg-side flip* (see Var^3 -gadget in the middle in Figure 3b).

And this is exactly the intuition behind transferring a possible variable assignment from SAT instance to a possible drawing of the CROSSING NUMBER instance, and back.

Suppose, given an instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ of SAT, that the reduction from the previous subsection returns (G, k) as an instance of CROSSING NUMBER.

► **Lemma 3.10.** *If $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ is a satisfiable instance of SAT, then the graph G of the constructed instance (G, k) admits a drawing \mathcal{G} such that $\text{cr}(\mathcal{G}) \leq k$.*

Proof. Again, let G' be the Frame with n Variable Gadgets which is a subgraph of G . We start with the drawing of G' as specified by Figure 1, which actually corresponds to the “minimal drawing” investigated in Lemma 3.7. We are going to show that this drawing has exactly the same number of crossings as claimed in Lemma 3.7.

Indeed, for every $i \in [n]$, the **R-left** and **R-right** paths of the Var^i -gadget each are crossed by h **B**-edges in our drawing, and the **B-pos** and **B-neg** paths of the Var^i -gadget each are crossed by $(h + 1)$ **R**-edges. Taking into account the alternating order of these crossings and the exact weights of the edges of these paths (see in Section 3.2), we count exactly $2\omega^3 \left(h\omega^4 + (h + 1)\omega^4 + \sum_{j=2}^{h+1} j(j + 1)\omega^1 + \sum_{j=1}^{h+1} j(j + 2)\omega^1 \right)$ crossings on Var^i . Summing over all $i \in [n]$, we get $2n \left((2h + 1)\omega^7 + \sum_{j=2}^{h+1} j(j + 1)\omega^4 + \sum_{j=1}^{h+1} j(j + 2)\omega^4 \right)$ crossings. There are no more crossings in our drawing of G' .

Now we add the cell gadgets of G to every **Var**-gadget, without additional crossings, and the **G**-edges denoted by e_j of all clauses $C_j \in \mathcal{C}$. The goal is to show that G is (can be) drawn with at most k crossings. Each **G**-edge e_j crosses every **Var**-gadget in total weight of $2\omega^6 + 4\omega^4 + \Theta_{n,\ell}(\omega^1)$ crossings, together giving another $2n\ell\omega^6 + 4n\ell\omega^4 + \Theta_{n,\ell}(\omega^1)$ crossings in our drawing. It only remains to estimate the weight of crossings of the **G**-edges e_j with the cell gadgets. If we can achieve the state that each **G**-edge e_j additionally crosses only one **C**-edge (of weight ω^2) of cell gadgets in every **Var**-gadget, then, comparing the full count to the reduction parameter definition $k = 2n(2h + 1)\omega^7 + 2n\ell\omega^6 + 4n\ell\omega^4 + 2n \sum_{j=2}^{h+1} j(j + 1)\omega^4 + 2n \sum_{j=1}^{h+1} j(j + 2)\omega^4 + n\ell\omega^2 + (\omega^2 - 1)$, we see that it is enough to have $\Theta_{n,\ell}(\omega^1) \leq \omega^2 - 1$. The latter holds true by our (sufficiently large) choice of the base weight ω .

It thus remains to show that aforementioned desired drawings of the **G**-edges e_j are simultaneously possible. Since the given SAT instance is satisfiable, there is a valuation τ of \mathcal{V} such that for every clause $C_j \in \mathcal{C}$, an occurrence of some variable $x_i \in \mathcal{V}$ in C_j satisfies C_j in τ . If the variable $x_i \in \mathcal{V}$, $i \in [n]$, is valued **True**, then the Var^i -gadget is pos-side flipped in our drawing of G' , i.e., that the **LB-pos** path of Var^i is to the left of the **LB-neg** path of Var^i . If x_i is **False**, then the Var^i -gadget is neg-side flipped, i.e., with **LB-pos** to the right.

Now, for every $C_j \in \mathcal{C}$, the edge e_j is drawn in the down-level of its cells area (as defined in Section 3.4), until we reach the cell in the Var^i -gadget where i is the least index such that an occurrence of x_i satisfies C_j in τ . Then, inside this Var^i -gadget, the edge e_j jumps up to the up-level of its cells area, as depicted in Figure 2a if $x_i \in C_j$, resp. in Figure 2b if $\bar{x}_i \in C_j$. The Figure shows that this jump-up is also possible with crossing only one **C**-edge in the cells gadget of Var^i . For the rest, the edge e_j is drawn in the up-level of its cells area. This is the sought solution to a drawing of the reduction graph G with at most k crossings; indeed, the edge e_j arrives to the right side of the Frame by $n + 1$ levels higher than its beginning on the left side. ◀

► **Lemma 3.11.** *If constructed G admits a drawing \mathcal{G} such that $\text{cr}(\mathcal{G}) \leq k$, then the original SAT instance $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ is satisfiable.*

Proof. If $\text{cr}(\mathcal{G}) \leq k$, then \mathcal{G} satisfies the drawings claims of Section 3.4 and, in particular, Lemma 3.8 and Lemma 3.9. We define a valuation $\tau : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$ as follows; $x_i \in \mathcal{V}$ is set **True** if Var^i pos-side flipped in \mathcal{G} (the **LB-pos** path of Var^i is drawn to the left of the **LB-neg** path of Var^i), and x_i is set **False** otherwise.

Now, for every clause $C_j \in \mathcal{C}$, the edge e_j in \mathcal{G} starts in the down-level of its cells area and ends in the up-level. By Lemma 3.9, there has to be a Var^i -gadget, $i \in [n]$, such that e_j jumps up to the up-level of its cells area within the subdrawing of Var^i in \mathcal{G} . By the definition of the cell types in the construction of G , see in Figure 2, this is possible in accordance with Lemma 3.8 (only one crossing with a **C**-edge) only if $x_i \in C_j$ and x_i is set to **True**, or if $\bar{x}_i \in C_j$ and x_i is set to **False**. In other words, if every $C_j \in \mathcal{C}$ is satisfied by our valuation τ . And this completes the proof. ◀

3.6 On Path-width of the Resulting Instance

The last missing ingredient in the proof of Theorem 3.1 (and hence, of Theorem 1.1) is an estimate of the path-width and tree-width of the constructed instance G . To obtain it, we will use the folklore characterization of path-width and tree-width via cops-and-robber games (see in Section 2.2).

We start with an auxiliary technical claim.

► **Lemma 3.12.** *Let H be a graph whose vertex set is partitioned into m disjoint parts $V(H) = A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_m$, and for some $a_i \leq b_i$, $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, let $A_i = \{v_{i,j} : a_i \leq j \leq b_i\}$. Assume that*

- a) *each A_i induces a path in H in the natural order of vertices $(v_{i,a_i}, v_{i,a_i+1}, \dots, v_{i,b_i})$,*
 - b) *if an edge $v_{i,j}v_{i',j'}$ exists in H for $i \neq i'$, then $|i - i'| = 1$ and $|j - j'| \leq 1$, and*
 - c) *there are no indices $i \neq i', j \neq j'$ such that both $v_{i,j}v_{i',j'} \in E(H)$ and $v_{i,j'}v_{i',j} \in E(H)$.¹*
- Then there exists a valid monotone search strategy for the cop player on H using $m + 1$ cops against an invisible robber. Furthermore, this strategy can be assumed to start with the cop player occupying the vertex subset $\{v_{1,a_1}, \dots, v_{m,a_m}\}$.*

Proof. First, we may without loss of generality assume that $a_1 = \dots = a_m = 1$ and $b_1 = \dots = b_m$, or we add dummy vertices and edges to H , and subsequently modify the cop strategy to occupy v_{i,a_i} instead of $v_{i,j}$ for $j < a_i$, and to occupy v_{i,b_i} instead of $v_{i,j}$ for $j > b_i$.

We start the search by placing cops onto $\{v_{1,1}, \dots, v_{m,1}\}$ and continue by induction. We say that vertices $v_{i,j}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ are on *level j* . Assume that the search has got to a state in which m cops occupy a set $X \subseteq V(H)$ such that X intersects each A_i in one vertex which is on level j or $j + 1$, all vertices on levels $\leq j$ are robber-free, there is no edge between levels j and $j + 1$ in $H - X$, and at least one cop of X is still on level j .

We call an edge $v_{i,j}v_{i+1,j} \in E(H)$ or $v_{i,j}v_{i-1,j} \in E(H)$ a *diagonal-up edge* from $v_{i,j}$. Let i, i' be such that $i + 1 < i'$ and $v_{i,j+1}, v_{i',j+1} \in X$ (or $i = 0$, or $i' = m + 1$), while $v_{i+1,j}, \dots, v_{i'-1,j} \in X$. By the “noncrossing” condition c) of the Lemma, we can have at most $i' - i - 2$ diagonal-up edges from $v_{i+1,j}, \dots, v_{i'-1,j}$ which do not have their end on level $j + 1$ in X . Hence, by the pigeon-hole principle, there is i'' , $i + 1 \leq i'' \leq i' - 1$, such that

¹ The graph H can be easily pictured as having a planar drawing with the paths on A_1, \dots, A_m drawn vertically in order from left to right, and other edges joining only neighboring verticals on the same horizontal level or between two consecutive levels.

the only neighbor of $v_{i'',j}$ on level $j + 1$ and not in X is $v_{i'',j+1}$. We place the remaining $(m + 1)$ -th cop on $v_{i'',j+1}$ and, subsequently, lift the cop from $v_{i'',j}$. By the stated conditions, the robber has no way to return to $v_{i'',j}$ or to any of the previously robber-free vertices again. The new cop-set $X' := (X \setminus \{v_{i'',j}\}) \cup \{v_{i'',j+1}\}$ clearly again satisfies the assumptions of the previous paragraph, and so we are done by induction. \blacktriangleleft

► **Proposition 3.13.** *For any given SAT instance, the graph G constructed in Section 3.3 (for the proof of Theorem 3.1) is of path-width at most 12 and of tree-width at most 9.*

Proof. The proof would be finished if we find a monotone search strategy for the cop player on G using 13 cops against an invisible robber, and one using 10 cops against a visible robber. We start with the former.

We start by placing 8 cops (see Figure 1) on vertices $r_{1,L}^1, r_{h+3,L}^1, u^{BL}, u^{TL}$ (left side of G) and $r_{1,R}^n, r_{h+3,R}^n, u^{BR}, u^{TR}$ (right side of G). Note (see Figure 3) that this placement of cops separates the set $U_0 \subseteq V(G)$ formed by the vertices of the left and right HB-paths of the Frame, and of the **R-left** path of Var^1 and the **R-right** path of Var^n from the rest of G . We can now use additional $4 + 1 = 5$ cops to search the subgraph induced by U_0 by using Lemma 3.12 (notice, however, that in this application the levels dealt with in Lemma 3.12 are shifted against the natural indexing from the construction of G).

After the previous initial phase, we continue the search by induction on $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. We assume 8 cops placed on vertices $r_{1,L}^i, r_{h+3,L}^i, u_0^{i-1}, w_0^{i-1}$ (the latter two being u^{BL}, u^{TL} if $i = 1$) and, again, $r_{1,R}^n, r_{h+3,R}^n, u^{BR}, u^{TR}$. Further, we assume that $V(\text{Var}^{i-1})$ (if $i > 1$) is already robber-free. We place 4 of the remaining cops onto vertices $u_0^i, u_1^i, w_1^i, w_0^i$, and subsequently lift the cops from $r_{1,L}^i, r_{h+3,L}^i, u_0^{i-1}, w_0^{i-1}$. We now have 5 free cops which can be used to search the **B-/LB-pos** and **B-/LB-neg** paths of Var^i by using Lemma 3.12. Then, we place 2 of the free cops onto $r_{1,L}^{i+1}, r_{h+3,L}^{i+1}$, and use the remaining 3 cops to search the **R-right** path of Var^i and the **R-left** path of Var^{i+1} , again by Lemma 3.12. After finishing previous, we may lift the cops from u_1^i and w_1^i , and we are back in the induction assumption with $i + 1$ instead of i .

It is easy to verify that the described procedure is a valid monotone search strategy against an invisible robber.

Regarding the tree-width subcase, we use knowledge of robber's position for a slight improvement of the previous search strategy. At the beginning, after placing cops on $r_{1,L}^1, r_{h+3,L}^1, u^{BL}, u^{TL}$ and $r_{1,R}^n, r_{h+3,R}^n, u^{BR}, u^{TR}$, we look at whether the robber is trapped inside the set U_0 and if this is the case, we throw in 9-th cop to catch the robber in U_0 by Lemma 3.12 while using also the 4 cops starting on $r_{1,L}^1, u^{BL}, r_{1,R}^n, u^{BR}$.

In the induction phase, whenever the robber is trapped inside the **B-/LB-pos** and **B-/LB-neg** paths of Var^i , we may instead use the 4 cops from $r_{1,R}^n, r_{h+3,R}^n, u^{BR}, u^{TR}$ to perform the catch by Lemma 3.12. We do likewise in the other subcase of the **R-right** path of Var^i and the **R-left** path of Var^{i+1} . When moving cops from the position on $r_{1,L}^i, r_{h+3,L}^i, u_0^{i-1}, w_0^{i-1}$ to next $u_0^i, u_1^i, w_1^i, w_0^i$, we now move cops in pairs — place onto u_0^i, u_1^i and lift from $r_{1,L}^i, u_0^{i-1}$, and then do the other pairs. We observe that the maximum number of cops needed in this strategy is $4 + 4 + 2 = 10$, and this is tight at the moment just before trapping the robber in the **R-right/R-left** paths. \blacktriangleleft

4 Conclusion

We have shown that the CROSSING NUMBER problem is NP-hard for graphs of path-width 12 (and as a result, even of tree-width 9). It is worth to remark that, since the measures

clique-width and rank-width are bounded by $\mathcal{O}(2^{tw})$, their width decompositions are also too much general to help deal with the CROSSING NUMBER problem. On the other hand, there are more restrictive parameterizations worth trying, e.g. treedepth, distance to linear forest (distance to disjoint paths), feedback vertex set number (distance to a forest), or cut-width or bandwidth.

Barely any of the existing results could be extended for the parameters above. Thus, investigation whether any of them could yield fixed-parameter tractability (or W-hardness) of CROSSING NUMBER is an interesting venue to explore. However, as it is known that CROSSING NUMBER is in FPT when parameterized by the solution value (k) [4, 9], it only makes sense to investigate those parameters which do not bound the crossing number itself.

References

- 1 Therese Biedl, Markus Chimani, Martin Derka, and Petra Mutzel. Crossing number for graphs with bounded pathwidth. *Algorithmica*, 82(2):355–384, 2020. doi:10.1007/S00453-019-00653-X.
- 2 Sergio Cabello. Hardness of approximation for crossing number. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 49(2):348–358, March 2013. doi:10.1007/S00454-012-9440-6.
- 3 Sergio Cabello and Bojan Mohar. Adding one edge to planar graphs makes crossing number and 1-planarity hard. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 42(5):1803–1829, 2013. doi:10.1137/120872310.
- 4 Éric Colin de Verdière and Thomas Magnard. An FPT algorithm for the embeddability of graphs into two-dimensional simplicial complexes. In *Proceedings of the 29th European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA)*, pages 32:1–32:17, 2021. See also arXiv:2107.06236.
- 5 Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-21275-3.
- 6 Giuseppe Di Battista, Peter Eades, Roberto Tamassia, and Ioannis G. Tollis. *Graph Drawing: Algorithms for the Visualization of Graphs*. Prentice-Hall, 1999.
- 7 Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory, 4th Edition*, volume 173 of *Graduate texts in mathematics*. Springer, 2012. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-53622-3.
- 8 Michael R. Garey and David S. Johnson. Crossing number is NP-complete. *SIAM J. Algebr. Discrete Methods*, 4(3):312–316, September 1983. doi:10.1137/0604033.
- 9 Martin Grohe. Computing crossing numbers in quadratic time. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 68(2):285–302, 2004.
- 10 Petr Hliněný. Crossing number is hard for cubic graphs. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 96(4):455–471, 2006. doi:10.1016/j.jctb.2005.09.009.
- 11 Petr Hliněný. Complexity of anchored crossing number and crossing number of almost planar graphs. *CoRR*, abs/2306.03490, 2023. doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2306.03490.
- 12 Petr Hliněný and Gelasio Salazar. On hardness of the joint crossing number. In *ISAAC*, volume 9472 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 603–613. Springer, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-48971-0_51.
- 13 Petr Hliněný and Abhisekh Sankaran. Exact crossing number parameterized by vertex cover. In Daniel Archambault and Csaba D. Tóth, editors, *Graph Drawing and Network Visualization - 27th International Symposium, GD 2019, Prague, Czech Republic, September 17-20, 2019, Proceedings*, volume 11904 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 307–319. Springer, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-35802-0_24.
- 14 Michael J. Pelsmayer, Marcus Schaefer, and Daniel Stefankovic. Crossing numbers and parameterized complexity. In Seok-Hee Hong, Takao Nishizeki, and Wu Quan, editors, *Graph Drawing, 15th International Symposium, GD 2007, Sydney, Australia, September 24-26, 2007. Revised Papers*, volume 4875 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 31–36. Springer, 2007. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-77537-9_6.

- 15 Paul D. Seymour and Robin Thomas. Graph searching and a min-max theorem for tree-width. *J. Comb. Theory B*, 58(1):22–33, 1993. doi:10.1006/jctb.1993.1027.
- 16 Paul Turán. A note of welcome. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 1(1):7–9, 1977. doi:10.1002/jgt.3190010105.
- 17 Meirav Zehavi. Parameterized analysis and crossing minimization problems. *Comput. Sci. Rev.*, 45:100490, 2022. doi:10.1016/J.COSREV.2022.100490.

