

Improved Outerplanarity Bounds for Planar Graphs

Therese Biedl^{*1} and Debajyoti Mondal²

¹ David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, University of Waterloo, Canada
biedl@uwaterloo.ca

² Department of Computer Science, University of Saskatchewan, Canada
d.mondal@usask.ca

Abstract. In this paper, we study the outerplanarity of planar graphs, i.e., the number of times that we must (in a planar embedding that we can initially freely choose) remove the outerface vertices until the graph is empty. It is well-known that there are n -vertex graphs with outerplanarity $\frac{n}{6} + \Theta(1)$, and not difficult to show that the outerplanarity can never be bigger. We give here improved bounds of the form $\frac{n}{2g} + 2g + O(1)$, where g is the *fence-girth*, i.e., the length of the shortest cycle with vertices on both sides. This parameter g is at least the connectivity of the graph, and often bigger; for example, our results imply that planar bipartite graphs have outerplanarity $\frac{n}{8} + O(1)$. We also show that the outerplanarity of a planar graph G is at most $\frac{1}{2}\text{diam}(G) + O(\sqrt{n})$, where $\text{diam}(G)$ is the diameter of the graph. All our bounds are tight up to smaller-order terms, and a planar embedding that achieves the outerplanarity bound can be found in linear time.

Keywords: Planar graphs · Outerplanarity · Fence girth · Diameter.

1 Introduction

The *outerplanarity* of a planar graph is a well-known tool, both for deriving efficient algorithms and for proving lower bounds for graph drawings. It measures how often we have to remove the vertices on the outerface (a *peel*) until the graph is empty. (Detailed definitions are in Section 2.) In this paper, we obtain better upper bounds on the outerplanarity of a planar graph, which is important from the perspective of the following two application areas.

The first application of outerplanarity is to design faster algorithms for various problems in planar graphs. Baker [3] showed that for a planar graph with constant outerplanarity, numerous graph problems, such as independent set, vertex cover, dominating set can all be solved in linear time. (There are numerous generalizations, see e.g. [16,17,12,20,21].) The running times of many such algorithms have an exponential dependency on the outerplanarity or related parameters. Hence an upper bound on the outerplanarity with respect to the size of

^{*} Corresponding author.

A preliminary version of the paper appeared at the 50th International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (WG 2024) [5].

the graph can provide an estimate of how large of a graph these algorithms may be able to process in practice.

Another major application of outerplanarity is to derive lower bounds for various optimization criteria in graph drawing. For example, there exists a planar graph with a fixed planar embedding (known as nested triangles graph) that requires at least a $\frac{2}{3}n \times \frac{2}{3}n$ -grid in any of its straight-line grid drawings that respect the given embedding (attributed to Leiserson [24] by Dolev, Trickey and Leighton [15]). Here a grid drawing maps each vertex to a grid point and each edge to a straight line segment between its end vertices. The crucial ingredient to their proof is that the nested triangles graph has $\frac{n}{3}$ peels (in this embedding), and any embedding-preserving planar straight-line grid-drawing of a planar graph with k peels requires at least a $2k \times 2k$ -grid. (In fact, this lower bound holds for many other planar graph drawing styles [1,19,31].) Nested triangles graphs have outerplanarity $\frac{n}{6}$, and thus gives a lower bound of an $\frac{n}{3} \times \frac{n}{3}$ -grid for the planar straight-line grid drawing even when one can freely choose an embedding to draw the graph. This raises a natural question of whether $\frac{n}{6}$ is the largest outerplanarity (perhaps up to lower-order terms) that a planar graph can have. This turns out to be true, via a detour into the radius, which we discuss next.

The *eccentricity* of a vertex v in G is the smallest integer k such that the shortest-path distance from v to any other vertex in G is at most k . The *radius* of G (denoted $\text{rad}(G)$) is the smallest eccentricity over all the vertices of G , while the *diameter* of G (denoted $\text{diam}(G)$) is the largest eccentricity. For 3-connected planar graphs, Harant [22] proved an upper bound of $\text{rad}(G) \leq \frac{n}{6} + \Delta^* + \frac{3}{2}$, where Δ^* is the maximum degree of the dual graph, i.e., the maximum length of a face. Ali et al. [2] improved the upper bound to $\frac{n}{6} + \frac{5\Delta^*}{6} + \frac{5}{6}$ and more generally $\frac{n}{2\kappa} + O(\Delta^*)$, where κ is the connectivity of the graph; these bounds are tight within an additive constant. This easily implies upper bounds on the outerplanarity.

Observation 1. *Every planar graph G has outerplanarity at most $\min\{1 + \text{rad}(G), \frac{n+26}{6}\}$, and this bound holds even if the spherical embedding of G is fixed.*

Proof. We first prove the radius-bound. Use as outerface a face that is incident to a vertex v of eccentricity $\text{rad}(G)$. Then all vertices z with $d_G(v, z) = i - 1$ belong to the i th peel or an earlier one, so after removing $\text{rad}(G) + 1$ peels the graph is empty.

For the second bound, arbitrarily add edges to G to make it into a maximal planar graph G^+ . This is triangulated, so using the result by Ali et al. [2] we have $\text{rad}(G^+) \leq \frac{n+20}{6}$ and hence outerplanarity at most $\frac{n+26}{6}$. The outerplanarity of subgraph G cannot be bigger. \square

A *triangulated graph* G is a maximal planar graph; in any planar embedding, faces then have length 3. It is folklore that for a triangulated graph, the difference between radius and outerplanarity is at most 1. But for graphs with greater face-lengths, the two parameters become very different (consider a cycle). The radius-bound on 3-connected graphs by Ali et al. *increases* as the faces get bigger, while

one would expect the outerplanarity to *decrease* as faces get bigger. So our goal in this paper is to find bounds on the outerplanarity that do not depend on the face-lengths and improve on $\frac{n}{6}$ for some graphs. We use a parameter that we call the *fence-girth*: In a planar graph G with a fixed embedding, a *fence* is a cycle C with other vertices both strictly inside and strictly outside C , and the *fence-girth* is the shortest length of a fence. (For a graph without cycles, the fence-girth is ∞ .) Our main result is the following:

C1. Every planar graph has outerplanarity at most $\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2g} \rfloor + O(g)$ for any integer $g \geq 3$ that is at most the fence-girth. We can find a planar embedding with this number of peels in linear time. Some graphs with fence-girth g have outerplanarity at least $\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2g} \rfloor$. (Section 4).

We are not aware of prior results for outerplanarity-bounds, but since the radius is closely related to it for triangulated graphs, we contrast our result to the best radius-bound of $\frac{n}{2\kappa} + O(\Delta^*)$ by Ali et al. [2]. The fence-girth is never less than the connectivity κ , so our theorem implies outerplanarity $\frac{n}{2\kappa} + O(1)$, where $\kappa \leq 5$. Hence up to small constant terms our bound is never worse than Ali et al.'s, and often it will be better. For example, for bipartite planar graphs the fence-girth is at least 4, so with $g = 4$ we obtain a bound of $\frac{n}{8} + O(1)$, whereas Ali et al.'s bound is only $\frac{n}{6} + O(1)$. Secondly, the prior bound held only for 3-connected planar graphs, while we make no such restrictions. Finally, we can find a suitable embedding in linear time while all existing algorithms for outerplanarity [6,23] take quadratic time or more.

For a triangulated graph G , the fence-girth is the same as the connectivity $\kappa \leq 5$. Result **C1.** hence implies that $\text{rad}(G) \leq \frac{n}{2\kappa} + O(1)$. This bound was previously known [2], but our result comes with a linear-time algorithm to find a vertex with this eccentricity, which is new:

C2. For a κ -connected triangulated graph G , we can find a vertex s with $d_G(s, z) \leq \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2\kappa} \rfloor + O(1)$ for all $z \in V(G)$ in linear time (Section 4).

Ali et al. did not study the run-time to find a vertex of small eccentricity; while their proof could be turned into an algorithm, its run-time would be $O(n \cdot \text{rad}(G))$, hence quadratic. The known subquadratic algorithms for computing the radius of a planar graph are far from being linear [8,18,30], and algorithms that provide $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation have running time of the form $O(f(1/\epsilon)n \log^2 n)$ [9,29], where f is a polynomial function on $(1/\epsilon)$. Linear-time algorithms for the radius are only known for special subclasses of planar graph classes [11,16].

Since the outerplanarity (for triangulated graphs) is closely related to the radius, and the radius is closely related to the diameter, it is natural to ask to bound the outerplanarity in terms of the diameter. We can show the following:

C3. Every planar graph G has outerplanarity at most $\frac{1}{2} \text{diam}(G) + O(\sqrt{n})$, and a corresponding embedding can be found in linear time. Every triangulated graph G has radius $\frac{1}{2} \text{diam}(G) + O(\sqrt{n})$, and a vertex of this eccentricity can be found in linear time. (Section 5).

Similar results with a ‘correction term’ of $O(\sqrt{n})$ have been studied before, for example, Boitmanis et al. [7] gave an algorithm that computes the diameter and radius within such an error term in $O(|E(G)|\sqrt{n})$ time. So our contribution is that we can find a vertex of eccentricity $\frac{1}{2}\text{diam}(G) + O(\sqrt{n})$ in linear time, hence faster than Boitmanis et al. [7].

We also show that this bound is tight and that the correction-term $O(\sqrt{n})$ cannot be avoided, not even for triangulated graphs. In particular, this answers (negatively) a question on `MathOverflow` [28] whether $\text{rad}(G) \leq \frac{1}{2}\text{diam}(G) + O(1)$ for all triangulated graphs; such a relationship does hold for interval graphs [26], chordal graphs [27], and various grid graphs and generalizations [11].

C4. There exists a triangulated graph G with radius $\frac{1}{2}\text{diam}(G) + \Omega(\sqrt{n})$ (Section 5).

2 Definitions

We assume familiarity with graph theory and planar graphs (see for example [14]) and fix throughout a planar graph G with n vertices. For a path π in G , the *length* $|\pi|$ is its number of edges. For two vertices y, z , write $d_G(y, z)$ for the length of the shortest path between them; we only need undirected graph distance, i.e., if G has directed edges then this measures the distance in the underlying undirected graph. For a set of vertices L , write $G \setminus L$ for the graph obtained by deleting the vertices in L and $G[L] := G \setminus (V \setminus L)$ for the graph induced by L . We need the following *separator theorem for trees*:

Theorem 2. [25] *Let \mathcal{T} be a tree with non-negative node-weights $w(\cdot)$. Then in linear time we can find a node S such that for every subtree \mathcal{T}' of $\mathcal{T} \setminus S$ we have $w(\mathcal{T}') \leq \frac{1}{2}w(\mathcal{T})$, where $w(\mathcal{T}')$ denotes the sum of weights of nodes in \mathcal{T}' .*

One easily derived consequence of the separator theorem is the following:

Observation 3. *Any connected graph G has a vertex with eccentricity at most $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ that we can find in linear time.*

Proof. Fix a spanning tree \mathcal{T} of the graph, and let s be the separator-node from Theorem 2, using unit weights. Then any subtree \mathcal{T}' of $\mathcal{T} \setminus \{s\}$ contains at most $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ nodes, and so the distance from s to any other node is at most $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. \square

A *spherical embedding* of G describes a drawing Γ of G on a sphere Σ by listing for each *face* (maximal region of $\Sigma \setminus \Gamma$) the closed walk(s) of G that bound the face. Graph G is called *triangulated* if all faces are triangles; the spherical embedding is then unique. A *planar embedding* of G is a drawing of G in the plane described by giving a spherical embedding Γ and fixing one face F (the *outerface*) which becomes the infinite face in the planar drawing.

For the following definition, assume that G is *plane* (comes with a fixed planar embedding (Γ, F)). Define the *peels* [23] of G as follows: L_1 consists of all vertices on the outerface F . For $i > 1$, L_i consists of all vertices on the

outerface of $G \setminus (L_1 \cup \dots \cup L_{i-1})$, where this graph uses as planar embedding the one inherited from G . The *number of peels* (which depends on Γ and F) is the minimum number k such that $G \setminus (L_1 \cup \dots \cup L_k)$ is the empty graph. We use the term *fixed-spherical-embedding (fse) outerplanarity* of G for the minimum number of peels over all choices of outerface F (but keeping the same spherical embedding Γ). The (unrestricted) *outerplanarity* of G is the minimum number of peels over all choices of spherical embedding Γ and outerface F of Γ .

3 Toolbox

In this section, we give some definitions and methods that will be used by multiple proofs later. Throughout, we assume that the input graph G comes with a fixed spherical embedding which we will never change. We also assume that G is connected, for if it is not then we can add edges between components that share a face until G is connected. This does not add cycles (so does not change the fence-girth) and it can only decrease the diameter (hence improve the outerplanarity bound), therefore adding such edges does not affect our results.

The tree of peels: We will compute a tree \mathcal{T} that stores, roughly speaking, the hierarchy of peels for some outerface, see also Figure 1. Formally, pick a *root-vertex* r arbitrarily, except that it should not be a cutvertex. Choose as outerface of G a face incident to r . Define $L_0 := \{r\}$ and compute the peels L_1, \dots, L_k of $G \setminus L_0$. These *layers* L_0, L_1, \dots, L_k are not quite the peels of G (because we start with one vertex rather than a face), and not quite the layers of a breadth-first search (BFS) tree (because we include in the next layer all vertices that share a face with vertices of the previous layer, whether they are adjacent or not). We direct each edge (y, z) from the higher-indexed to the lower-indexed layer; edges connecting vertices within a layer remain undirected.

We organize the layers L_0, \dots, L_k into a tree \mathcal{T} (the *tree of peels*) as follows: The root of \mathcal{T} is a node R that corresponds to the entire graph G ; define $V(R) := \{r\}$. For $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, add a node N_K to \mathcal{T} for each connected component K of $G \setminus (L_0 \cup \dots \cup L_{i-1})$. Component K is part of one connected component P of $G \setminus (L_0 \cup \dots \cup L_{i-2})$; make N_K a child of the node N_P corresponding to P in \mathcal{T} . Define $V(N_K)$ to be the outerface vertices of K .

Throughout this paper, we will use ‘node’ (and upper-case letters) for the elements of \mathcal{T} while we reserve ‘vertex’ (and lower-case letters) for G . An *interior node* of \mathcal{T} is a node that is neither the root nor a leaf. We think of each node N as ‘storing’ the vertices in $V(N)$ and observe that these vertices induce a connected subgraph. Also, every vertex of G is stored at exactly one node of \mathcal{T} . We need a few easy observations:

Observation 4. *The following holds for the tree of peels \mathcal{T} :*

1. *The root R of \mathcal{T} has a single child.*
2. *Let Y, Z be the nodes that store the ends y, z of an edge e . Then either e is undirected and $Y=Z$, or e is directed (say $y \rightarrow z$) and Z is the parent of Y .*




Fig. 1: (a) A plane graph G . (b)–(e) The graphs obtained by deleting L_0, L_1, \dots, L_3 , respectively. Solid vertices are the set $V(N)$ of the corresponding node N . (f) The tree of peels \mathcal{T} . (g) The augmentation H .

3. For any interior node N of \mathcal{T} , the size $|V(N)|$ is at least the fence-girth.

Proof. (1) We chose root-vertex r so that it is not a cutvertex; therefore $G \setminus L_0 = G \setminus r$ is connected and there is only one node that is a child of R .

(2) For edge (y, z) , let i be the smallest index for which layer L_i contains y or z . If both y, z are in L_i , then y, z belong to the same node since they are in one connected component. If one of them (say y) is not in L_i , then $y \in L_{i+1}$, so the edge is directed $y \rightarrow z$ and Y becomes a child of Z since the edge (y, z) ensures that y is in the connected component that defined Z .

(3) Recall that node N corresponds to a connected component K_N of the graph obtained by deleting some of the levels. Since N is not a leaf, subgraph K_N has at least one vertex v not on the outerface. Therefore, the outerface of K_N contains a cycle that has v inside and r outside (since $N \neq R$). This cycle is a fence and all its vertices belong to $V(N)$. \square

Augmenting G : It will be helpful if every vertex except root-vertex r has an outgoing edge. In general, this need not hold for our input graph G . We therefore augment G with further edges. The following result was shown in [4]; the result there was for the peels while our definition of layers L_0, \dots, L_k is slightly different, but one easily verifies that the proof carries over.

Claim 5. (based on Obs. 2 in [4]) We can add edges to G (while maintaining planarity) such that for all $i \geq 1$ every vertex in L_i has a neighbour in L_{i-1} .

Let H be the graph obtained by adding a set of directed edges such every vertex except r has an outgoing edge in H (Figure 1g). Because we only add edges between adjacent layers, the following is easily shown.

Observation 6. The augmented graph H has the same tree of peels as G (assuming we start with the inherited planar embedding and outerface and use the same root-vertex).

Proof. Observe first that since we start with the same root-vertex and outerface, and only add directed edges, the layers L_0, \dots, L_k are exactly the same in both

G and H . Assume H is obtained by adding just one edge $e = (y, z)$ (the full proof is then by induction on the number of added edges). Observe that y, z belong to one face F of G since we can add edge (y, z) to G while staying planar. Since G is connected, so is the boundary of F . For any face the vertices belong to at most two consecutive layers by definition of peels; for the specific face F the vertices belong to exactly two consecutive layers (say L_i and L_{i+1}) since they include y, z which are not on the same layer by construction of H . So there exists in G a path π (along the boundary of F) that connects y and z and has all vertices in L_i and L_{i+1} .

With this, the connected components that define the tree of peels are exactly the same for both graphs. To see this, observe that when we have removed $L_0 \cup \dots \cup L_{h-1}$ for some $h \leq i$, then edge (y, z) provides no connectivity among components that we did not have via path π instead. Once we have removed L_i , one of y, z (and hence the added edge) has been removed from the graph, and so again does not add any connectivity. \square




Fig. 2: Larger example of \mathcal{T} and the detour-method to connect $s_0 \in A_0$ with $z_0 \in A_0$, as well as s to z as in Claim 9. Not all directed edges are shown for clarity.

Adding edges to G may decrease the fence-girth, but not the node-sizes of \mathcal{T} , which is all that will be used below. We will in the following *only* consider graph H , so every vertex $z \neq r$ has an outgoing edge.

The detour-method: We need the following method to connect two given vertices of H that are stored in the same node of \mathcal{T} (Figure 3a and Figure 2).

Definition 1. Fix a node A_0 of \mathcal{T} , and two vertices $s_0, z_0 \in V(A_0)$, as well as exit conditions $\xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2, \dots$ which are (possibly negative) integers that will be specified by each application. The detour method at node A_0 finds a path connecting s_0 and z_0 as follows:

- Initialize $i = 0$; we have $s_i, z_i \in V(A_i)$. We will also maintain paths τ_s (from s_0 to s_i) and τ_z (from z_0 to z_i); initially these are simply $\langle s_0 \rangle$ and $\langle z_0 \rangle$.
- If $d_H(s_i, z_i) \leq \xi_i$, then set σ to be a path from s_i to z_i that has distance at most ξ_i . Exit with ‘success’ and return i and τ_s, τ_z, σ .
- If $d_H(s_i, z_i) > \xi_i$, and A_i was the root, then return ‘fail’.
- Otherwise let A_{i+1} be the parent of A_i . Find directed edges $s_i \rightarrow s_{i+1}$ and $z_i \rightarrow z_{i+1}$, append them to paths τ_s and τ_z , update $i \leftarrow i+1$ and repeat.

Since each iteration gets us closer to the root, the algorithm must terminate. If it exits successfully, say at index i^* , then we get a walk $s_0 \xrightarrow{\tau_s} s_{i^*} \xrightarrow{\sigma} z_{i^*} \xrightarrow{\tau_z} z_0$. To bound the length of this walk, the following observation will be useful:

Observation 7. *If the detour-method does not succeed at index $i > 0$, and A_i is not the root, then $\lfloor \frac{1}{2}|V(A_i)| \rfloor \geq \xi_i + 1$.*

Proof. Recall that there are directed edges $s_{j-1} \rightarrow s_j$ and $z_{j-1} \rightarrow z_j$ by $j > 0$ and that $s_{j-1}, z_{j-1} \in A_{j-1}$. Write G_j for the graph induced by $V(A_j)$, and observe that $V(A_{j-1})$ must all belong to one inner face F of G_j since it bounds a connected component of the subgraph of G where the peels up to A_j have been removed. Furthermore, s_j, z_j have neighbours both strictly inside and strictly outside F (due to their outgoing edges). So there must be a simple cycle C along the boundary of F that contains both s_j and z_j . Walking along the shorter side of C hence gives a walk from s_j to z_j of length at most $\lfloor |C|/2 \rfloor \leq \lfloor |V(A_j)|/2 \rfloor$. By $j < i^*$ the stopping-condition did not hold at A_j , so this implies $\lfloor |V(A_j)|/2 \rfloor > \xi_i$ and the result holds by integrality. \square

We demonstrate how to use the detour-method with the following result that will be needed later. For any node N , write $\mathbf{a}(N)$ for the number of vertices stored at strict ancestors of N .

Lemma 1. *Assume that $|V(N)| \geq 3$ for all interior nodes N . For any node A_0 and any $s_0, t_0 \in V(A_0)$ we have $d_H(s_0, t_0) \leq \max\{2\lceil \sqrt{\mathbf{a}(A_0)} \rceil - 2, 4\}$.*

Proof. We are done if A_0 is the root R or its child or a grandchild of R , for then we can connect s_0 and t_0 with a path of length at most 4 by following directed edges until we reach root-vertex r . So assume that A_0 has a parent P , grandparent G_1 and great-grandparent G_2 , therefore $\mathbf{a}(A_0) \geq |V(P)| + |V(G_1)| + |V(G_2)| \geq 3 + 3 + 1 = 7$ since P and G_1 are internal nodes. Hence $\lceil \sqrt{\mathbf{a}(A_0)} \rceil \geq 3$ and the desired upper bound is $2\lceil \sqrt{\mathbf{a}(A_0)} \rceil - 2 \geq 4$. For ease of writing define $\beta = \lceil \sqrt{\mathbf{a}(A_0)} \rceil - 3 \geq 0$, so the desired upper bound becomes $2\beta + 4$. Apply the detour-method at A_0 , using $\xi_i = 2\beta + 4 - 2i$ for $i \geq 0$. If the method returns successfully at index i^* with paths τ_s, τ_z, σ , then combining the three paths gives $d(s_0, t_0) \leq |\tau_s| + |\tau_z| + |\sigma| \leq 2i^* + 2\beta + 4 - 2i^*$ as desired.

So now assume for contradiction that the detour-method fails, and let A_i, s_i, z_i (for $i = 0, \dots, \ell$) be the nodes and vertices that it used; we have $A_\ell = R$ since the method can only fail at the root. Since the detour-method did not succeed at R , we did not have a path of length at most ξ_ℓ from s_ℓ to z_ℓ . But $|R| = 1$, so $s_\ell = r = z_\ell$ are connected by a path of length 0. So $0 > \xi_\ell = 2\beta + 4 - 2\ell$ or $\ell > \beta + 2$. Now bound the sizes of $V(A_1), \dots, V(A_\ell)$ as follows:




Fig. 3: (a) Path-finding for nodes in $V(\mathcal{T}_R)$ when Z is not a descendent of S . (b) Path-finding by using a detour at S when Z is a descendent of S . (c) Path-finding for deep descendants of S . (d) Finding a small common ancestor of deep nodes.

- For $i = 1, \dots, \beta+2$, Observation 7 implies $|V(A_i)| \geq 2(\xi_i+1) = 4\beta+10-4i > 3\beta+8-4i$.
- For $i = \beta+1$, this bound becomes $|V(A_i)| \geq 4\beta+10-4(\beta+1) = 6$.
- For $i = \beta+2$, we also know $|V(A_i)| \geq 3$ since A_i is not the root by $\ell > \beta+2$.
- Root A_ℓ stores one vertex r .

We therefore have a contradiction:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\beta+3)^2 &\geq \mathbf{a}(A_0) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} |V(A_i)| \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\beta} (3\beta+8-4i) + 6 + 3 + 1 \\
 &> \sum_{i=1}^{\beta} (3\beta+6) + \sum_{i=1}^{\beta} (2-4i) + 9 \\
 &= 3\beta^2 + 6\beta - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\beta} (2i-1) + 9 = 3\beta^2 + 6\beta - 2\beta^2 + 9 = (\beta+3)^2
 \end{aligned}$$

□

4 Outerplanarity and fence-girth

In this section, we first prove that any planar graph G has outerplanarity at most $\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2g} \rfloor + O(g)$ where $g \geq 3$ is a (user-given) integer that is supposed to be at most the fence-girth.³ Then we discuss implications and lower bounds.

³ We use a parameter g that is separate from the fence-girth since the latter can be $\Theta(n)$; to minimize the upper bound one should set g to be $\min\{\text{fence-girth}, \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{n-2}\}$.

Separator-node S : To prove the upper bound, define the layers L_0, L_1, \dots , augmentation H and tree of peels \mathcal{T} as in Section 3. If any interior node of \mathcal{T} stores fewer than g vertices, then report that g was too big (cf. Obs. 4(3)) and abort. Otherwise, apply the separator theorem (Theorem 2) to the tree \mathcal{T} , using node-weight $w(N) := |V(N)|$, i.e., the number of stored vertices. Let S be a node such that any subtree \mathcal{T}' of $\mathcal{T} \setminus S$ stores at most $\frac{n}{2}$ vertices; we write $V(\mathcal{T}')$ for these stored vertices. We know that $S \neq R$, because the root has only one child, and $w(\mathcal{T} \setminus R) = n - 1 > \frac{n}{2}$.

Crucially, S is close to all other nodes of \mathcal{T} . Since we will frequently need the following upper bound, we introduce a convenient notation δ for it.

Observation 8. *For any node Z of \mathcal{T} we have $d_{\mathcal{T}}(S, Z) \leq \delta := \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2g} \rfloor + 1$.*

Proof. Let Π be the path from S to Z in \mathcal{T} . Every interior node N of Π belongs to the same subtree \mathcal{T}' of $\mathcal{T} \setminus S$, and satisfies $|V(N)| \geq g$ since it is neither leaf nor root. Node $Z \neq S$ also belongs to \mathcal{T}' and $|V(Z)| \geq 1$. Altogether therefore $\frac{n}{2} \geq |V(\mathcal{T}')| \geq g(|\Pi| - 1) + 1$ or $|\Pi| \leq \frac{n-2}{2g} + 1$, which implies $d_{\mathcal{T}}(S, Z) = |\Pi| \leq \delta$ by integrality. \square

The overall idea of our proof is now to pick a vertex $s \in V(S)$, and to argue that $d_H(s, z) \leq \delta + 2g - 2$ for all vertices z . Actually, for most cases below, this will hold for *any* choice of $s \in S$.

Vertices stored in \mathcal{T}_R : Let \mathcal{T}_R be the subtree of $\mathcal{T} \setminus S$ that contains root R . For vertices in this subtree, the detour method proves the distance-bound.

Claim 9. *Assume that $g \geq 3$. For any $s \in V(S)$ and any $z \in V(\mathcal{T}_R)$ we have $d_H(s, z) \leq \delta + g$.*

Proof. Figures 2 and 3a illustrate this proof. Let Z be the node that stores z , and let A_0 be the least common ancestor of S and Z ; this is a strict ancestor of S since $Z \in \mathcal{T}_R$. Follow directed edges from s to some vertex $s_0 \in V(A_0)$; the resulting path π_s has length $d_{\mathcal{T}}(S, A_0)$ since every directed edge gets us closer to the root. Likewise we can get a path π_z of length $d_{\mathcal{T}}(Z, A_0)$ from z to some node $z_0 \in V(A_0)$ (possibly $z_0 = z$).

Now apply the detour-method with A_0, s_0, z_0 , using $\xi_i = g - 1$. This will always exit with ‘success’ at a node A_{i^*} that is not the root, because any two vertices stored at the child of the root have outgoing edges towards the root-vertex r and hence distance $2 \leq g - 1$. Let τ_s, τ_z, σ be the paths, then $\pi := s \xrightarrow{\pi_s} s_0 \xrightarrow{\tau_s} s_{i^*} \xrightarrow{\sigma} z_{i^*} \xrightarrow{\tau_z} z_0 \xrightarrow{\pi_z} z$ has length $d_{\mathcal{T}}(S, Z) + 2i^* + |\sigma|$.

To bound $|\pi|$, consider the path Π from S to Z in \mathcal{T} , which goes through A_0 , and let A_1, \dots, A_{i^*} be the ancestors of A_0 that were visited by the detour-method. If $i^* > 0$, then by Obs. 7 we have $|V(A_j)| \geq 2(\xi_j + 1) = 2g$ for $j = 1, \dots, i^* - 1$, node A_{i^*} and the interior nodes of Π store at least g vertices each which nodes Z and R store at least one vertex. Therefore

$$\frac{n}{2} \geq |V(\mathcal{T}_R)| \geq 2g(i^* - 1) + g + (|\Pi| - 1)g + 1 + 1 \geq g(|\Pi| + 2i^* - 2) + 2,$$

hence $|\Pi| + 2i^* \leq \frac{n-4}{2g} + 2$ which is at most $\delta + 1$ by integrality. If $i^* = 0$ then $|\Pi| + 2i^* \leq \delta$ by Obs. 8. Either way $|\pi| = |\Pi| + 2i^* + |\sigma| \leq \delta + 1 + (g - 1)$. \square

Vertices at descendants of S : In light of Claim 9, we only need to worry about vertices that are stored at descendants of S . We first introduce two methods to find short paths for these in special situations. Recall that $\mathbf{a}(S)$ denotes the number of vertices stored at strict ancestors of node S .

Claim 10. *Assume that $\mathbf{a}(S) \leq g^2$ and $g \geq 3$. Then for any $s \in V(S)$ and any vertex z stored at a descendant Z of S we have $d_H(s, z) \leq \delta + 2g - 2$.*

Proof. See also Figure 3b. Use directed edges to find a path π_z of length $d_{\mathcal{T}}(Z, S) \leq \delta$ from z to some vertex $z_0 \in V(S)$. We know $d_H(s, z_0) \leq \max\{2\lfloor\sqrt{\mathbf{a}(S)}\rfloor - 2, 4\} \leq 2g - 2$ by Lemma 1. Combining the paths gives the desired length: $d_H(z, s) \leq d_H(z, z_0) + d_H(z_0, s) \leq \delta + 2g - 2$. \square

Claim 11. *Let D be a descendant of S . Let $s_D \in V(D)$ be a vertex of eccentricity at most $\lfloor\frac{|V(D)|}{2}\rfloor$ in the connected graph $H[V(D)]$ (Obs. 3). Follow directed edges from s_D to reach a vertex $s \in V(S)$. Then for any vertex z stored at a descendant Z of D we have $d_H(s, z) \leq d_{\mathcal{T}}(Z, S) + \lfloor\frac{|V(D)|}{2}\rfloor$.*

Proof. See Figure 3c. Use directed edges to go from z to a vertex $z_D \in V(D)$ along a path π_z of length $d_{\mathcal{T}}(Z, D)$. Find a path σ of length at most $\lfloor\frac{|V(D)|}{2}\rfloor$ to connect z_D to s_D , and then follow $d_{\mathcal{T}}(D, S)$ directed edges to get to s . Combining the paths gives the desired length since $d_{\mathcal{T}}(Z, D) + d_{\mathcal{T}}(D, S) = d_{\mathcal{T}}(Z, S)$. \square

Corollary 1. *Assume that $|V(S)| \leq 4g - 3$. Then there exists an $s \in V(S)$ such that for any vertex z stored at a descendant of S we have $d_H(s, z) \leq \delta + 2g - 2$.*

So we are done if $\mathbf{a}(S) \leq g^2$ or $|V(S)| \leq 4g - 3$. Otherwise we distinguish the descendants of S by their depth, using Claim 11 (for a carefully chosen D) for the ‘deep’ ones and the method of Claim 10 for the others. Define the *threshold-value* $\theta = \lceil\frac{n - \mathbf{a}(S)}{2g}\rceil - 1$, call a node Z *deep* if it is a descendant of S with $d_{\mathcal{T}}(S, Z) \geq \theta$, and call a vertex *deep* if it is stored at a deep node. A straightforward math manipulation gives the following upper bound.

Observation 12. *We have $\theta \leq \delta - 2\lceil\sqrt{\mathbf{a}(S)}\rceil + 2g + 1$.*

Proof. Recall that $\delta = \lfloor\frac{n-2}{2g}\rfloor + 1$ is an integer and observe that $\delta \geq \frac{n-1}{2g}$. We also know that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq (\sqrt{\mathbf{a}(S)} - 2g)^2 = \mathbf{a}(S) - 4g\sqrt{\mathbf{a}(S)} + 4g^2 \\ \text{or } \frac{\mathbf{a}(S)}{2g} &\geq 2\sqrt{\mathbf{a}(S)} - 2g > 2\lceil\sqrt{\mathbf{a}(S)}\rceil - 2g - 2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\theta = \lceil\frac{n - \mathbf{a}(S)}{2g}\rceil - 1 \leq \frac{n - \mathbf{a}(S) - 1}{2g} = \frac{n-1}{2g} - \frac{\mathbf{a}(S)}{2g} < \delta - 2\lceil\sqrt{\mathbf{a}(S)}\rceil + 2g + 2.$$

which yields the result by integrality. \square

Claim 13. *Assume that $g \geq 3$ and $|V(S)| \geq 4g - 2$ and $\mathbf{a}(S) > g^2$. Then for any $s \in V(S)$ and any z stored at a descendant Z of S that is not deep, we have $d_H(s, z) \leq \delta + 2g - 2$.*

Proof. The method is exactly the same as in the proof of Claim 10 (walk from z to a vertex $z_0 \in V(S)$ and apply Lemma 1 to connect z_0 to s , see also Figure 3b), but the analysis is different. Since Z is not deep, we have $d_H(z, z_0) = d_{\mathcal{T}}(Z, S) \leq \theta - 1 \leq \delta - 2 \lceil \sqrt{\mathbf{a}(S)} \rceil + 2g$. By $\mathbf{a}(S) > g^2 \geq 9$ we have $d_H(z_0, s) \leq 2 \lceil \sqrt{\mathbf{a}(S)} \rceil - 2$ and so $d_H(z, s) \leq d_H(z, z_0) + d_H(z_0, s) \leq \delta + 2g - 2$. \square

For deep nodes we show that there exists a suitable node with which to apply Claim 11. This is proved via a counting-argument: due to the (carefully chosen) threshold θ otherwise more than n vertices would be stored in tree \mathcal{T} .

Claim 14. *Assume that at least $4g - |V(S)| + 1$ vertices are deep. Then there exists a descendant D of S (possibly S itself) such that D is an ancestor of all deep nodes, and $|V(D)| \leq 2g - 1$.*

Proof. Let X be the least common ancestor of all deep nodes. This is a descendant of S as well (possibly $X = S$), so enumerate the path from S to X as $S = D_0, D_1, \dots, D_k = X$ for some $k \geq 0$. We are done if $|V(D_i)| \leq 2g - 1$ for some $0 \leq i \leq k$, so assume (for contradiction) that the k nodes D_1, \dots, D_k store at least $2g$ vertices each. If X were deep (so $k \geq \theta$) then D_1, \dots, D_k would store at least $\theta \cdot 2g \geq n - \mathbf{a}(S) - 2g$ vertices. We also store $\mathbf{a}(S)$ vertices at strict ancestors at S , $|V(S)|$ vertices at S and at least $4g - |V(S)| + 1$ deep vertices, in total hence more than n , impossible.

So X is not deep, see also Figure 3d. Since X is the least common ancestor of deep descendants, therefore it must have at least two children X^1, X^2 that are ancestors of deep descendants. For $j = 1, 2$, enumerate the path from X^j to a deep descendant of X^j as $D_{k+1}^j, \dots, D_{\theta}^j$. Then for $i = k+1, \dots, \theta-1$ node D_i^j is not a leaf and stores at least g vertices, so $|V(D_i^1)| + |V(D_i^2)| \geq 2g$. So for $i = 1, \dots, \theta-1$ we can find $2g$ vertices stored at not-deep descendants of distance i from S . In total these not-deep strict descendants of S hence store at least $(\theta-1)2g \geq n - \mathbf{a}(S) - 4g$ vertices. As above therefore more than n vertices are stored in the tree of peels, impossible. \square

Now we put everything together.

Theorem 15. *Let G be a planar graph with $n \geq 3$ vertices and let $g \geq 3$ be an integer that is at most the fence-girth of G . Then G has a planar supergraph H with $\text{rad}(H) \leq \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2g} \rfloor + 2g - 1$. Furthermore, a vertex of H with this eccentricity can be found in linear time.*

Proof. Compute layers L_0, L_1, \dots , augmentation H , and tree of peels \mathcal{T} as in Section 3. Find separator-node S and compute $|V(S)|, \mathbf{a}(S), \theta$, and the number of deep vertices. If $|V(S)| \geq 4g - 2$ and there are at least $4g - |V(S)| + 1$ deep vertices, then arbitrarily fix a deep node Z and find node D of Claim 14 by walking from S towards Z until we encounter a node that stores at most $2g - 1$

vertices. In all other cases set $D := S$. Pick s as in Claim 11 applied to D . Each of these steps takes linear time (we elaborate on this in Section 4.1).

Applying various cases we show that $d_H(s, z) \leq \delta + 2g - 2$ for all z (which implies the result by $\delta = \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2g} \rfloor + 1$). This holds for all $z \in V(\mathcal{T}_R)$ by Claim 9, so consider a vertex z stored at a descendant Z of S . The bound holds by Claim 10 if $\mathbf{a}(S) \leq g^2$ and by Corollary 1 if $|V(S)| \leq 4g - 3$, so assume neither. If Z is not deep, then apply Claim 13. If Z is deep and there are at least $4g - |V(S)| + 1$ deep vertices, then combine Claim 14 with Claim 11 to get the bound. The only remaining case is that $\mathbf{a}(S) > g^2$, $|V(S)| \geq 4g - 2$, Z is deep, and at most $4g - |V(S)|$ vertices are deep (so $|V(S)| \leq 4g - 1$ since there is a deep vertex at Z). In this case, $d_{\mathcal{T}}(Z, S) = \theta$, for otherwise Z 's parent would also be deep and store $g \geq 3 \geq 4g - |V(S)| + 1$ deep vertices. Also $\theta \leq \delta - 2 \lceil \sqrt{\mathbf{a}(S)} \rceil + 2g + 1 \leq \delta - 1$ by $\lceil \sqrt{\mathbf{a}(S)} \rceil \geq g + 1$. We used $D = S$ and picked $s \in V(S)$ as in Claim 11, so this gives $d_H(z, s) \leq d_{\mathcal{T}}(Z, S) + \lceil \frac{|V(S)|}{2} \rceil \leq \delta - 1 + 2g - 1$ as desired. \square

Theorem 15 implies **C2** from the introduction, for if G is triangulated then necessarily $H = G$ and so the radius-bound holds for the input-graph G as well. It also implies **C1**:

Corollary 2. *Let G be a spherically-embedded graph with $n \geq 3$ vertices and let $g \geq 3$ be an integer that is at most the fence-girth of G . Then G has fse-outerplanarity at most $\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2g} \rfloor + 2g$. Furthermore, an outerface of G that achieves this outerplanarity can be found in linear time.*

Proof. Without changing the spherical embedding of G , compute the super-graph H with $\text{rad}(H) \leq \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2g} \rfloor + 2g - 1$; the outerplanarity bound holds by Obs. 1 and the outerface can be found by picking any face incident to the vertex s that achieves this eccentricity. \square

Discussion: Theorem 15 requires $g \geq 3$. We can always choose such a g if G is simple, but if G has parallel edges or loops (which we did not exclude) then in the fixed spherical embedding the fence-girth may only be 2 or 1. We hence briefly discuss the case $g \in \{1, 2\}$. Going through all proofs where $g \geq 3$ or $|V(N)| \geq 3$ is actually used (Lemma 1, Claim 9 and 10), one sees that the results hold for $g = 2$ if we increase the permitted distance-bound by 2. (Likewise we need to raise the permitted distance-bound in Claim 13 since it uses Lemma 1.) Therefore $\text{rad}(H) \leq \delta + 2g = \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2g} \rfloor + 1$ for $g = 2$. For $g = 1$, $\text{rad}(H) \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor = \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2g} \rfloor + 1$ by Obs. 3.

Theorem 15 also assumes that we are *given* g . However, the computation of \mathcal{T} does not depend on g , and the only thing we require is that all its interior nodes store at least g vertices. So if we are not given g , then we can compute \mathcal{T} , define $g^* = \min\{|V(N)| : N \text{ is an interior node}\}$ and use $g := \min\{g^*, \sqrt{n-2}/2\}$ as parameter for Theorem 15.

4.1 Run-time considerations

In this section, we elaborate on why the various steps of our algorithm can be implemented in linear time. No complicated data structures are needed for this; all bounds can be obtained via careful accounting of the visited edges.

Our first step is to compute the layers L_0, L_1, \dots , given the spherical embedding and the root-vertex r . This can simply be done with a breadth-first search as follows. Temporarily compute the *radial graph*, which is a bipartite with one vertex class the vertices of G and the other vertex class with one vertex per face of the planar embedding; it has edges whenever a face is incident to a vertex. Then the layers L_0, L_1, \dots are the same as the even-indexed BFS-layers of the radial graph if we start the breadth first search at root r . Clearly this takes linear time to compute.

Next we must compute the augmentation H . It follows directly from the proof in [4] that this can be done in linear time by scanning each face, but for completeness' sake we repeat this proof and analyze the run-time here.

Claim 16. *The augmentation H can be computed in linear time.*

Proof. We first paraphrase the proof from [4] to show that graph H exists. Consider any face F , and fix one vertex w of F that minimizes its layer-number (i.e., the index i of the layer L_i containing w). Break ties among choices for w arbitrarily. For any vertex $v \neq w$ on F that is not in L_i , add an edge (v, w) if it did not exist already. Clearly this maintains planarity since all new edges can be drawn inside face F . Repeat at all faces to get the edges for graph H . To see that this satisfies the condition, consider an arbitrary vertex v in layer L_i for some $i > 0$. Thus v was on the outer-face of $G \setminus (L_0 \cup \dots \cup L_{i-1})$, but *not* on the outer-face of $G \setminus (L_0 \cup \dots \cup L_{i-2})$. It follows that some face F incident to v had vertices in L_{i-1} . So our procedure added an edge from v to some vertex in face F that is in layer L_{i-1} .

To find the edges efficiently, we assume that every vertex stores its layer-number. For each face F we can then walk along F in $O(\deg(F))$ time to find one vertex w with the smallest layer-number. In a second walk along F , add all edges (v, w) of H that fall within face F . The only non-trivial step is to check whether (v, w) already existed. This could be done with suitable data structures in $O(1)$ amortized time per edge, but the simplest approach is to not check this at all; duplicate edges in H do not hurt us since we add at most $\deg(F)$ edges per face and hence a linear number of edges in total. \square

Our next step is to compute the tree of peels \mathcal{T} of H , for which the main challenge is to compute the connected components after we have deleted some layers L_0, \dots, L_i . Assume we have kept track of all edges E_i that connect L_i to L_{i+1} . For each $(y, z) \in E_i$ (say with $z \in L_{i+1}$), walk along the face F to the right of (y, z) , from z and away from y , until we reach another edge $(y', z') \in E_i$ for which F is to the left. Repeat at the face to the right of (y', z') , and continue repeating until we return to edge (y, z) at the face to its left. The visited vertices form the outer-face of one connected component of $G \setminus (L_0 \cup \dots \cup L_i)$, so define

a new node N for them, set $V(N)$ to be the visited vertices, and make N the child of the node that stored y . If there are edges of E_i left that have not been visited yet, then repeat at them to obtain the next node. At the end we have determined all nodes that together cover layer L_{i+1} . The run-time for this is proportional to $|L_{i+1}| + |E_i|$, so linear over all layers.

The next few steps (in the proof of Theorem 15) are to compute a number of values, and to traverse \mathcal{T} to determine all deep nodes and the number of vertices that they store; clearly this can be done in $O(|\mathcal{T}|)$ time. Likewise we can find the appropriate node D to use in linear time, and finding s can then be done in $O(|V(D)| + |\mathcal{T}|)$ by using Observation 3 to find a central node s_D in D and then following outgoing edges until we reach $s \in S$. The rest of the proof is an argument that the radius is small if we use s as center, but we do not actually need to perform any computation here since we already found the appropriate s . So overall the run-time for Theorem 15 is linear, and similarly one argues the run-time for Corollary 2.

4.2 Tightness

We now design graphs with large outerplanarity (relative to the fence-girth g). (These graphs actually have *girth* g , i.e., *any* cycle (not just those that are fences) has length at least g .) We do this first for the fixed-spherical-embedding outerplanarity, where the lower bounds hold even for $g \in \{1, 2\}$. Then, for $g \geq 3$ and at a slight decrease of the lower bound, we give bounds for the (unrestricted) outerplanarity. Roughly speaking, the graphs consist of nested cycles of length g , with a single vertex or path inside the innermost / outside the outermost cycle, and (if desired) with edges added to ensure that all spherical embeddings have the same fse-outerplanarity. See Figure 5.

Lemma 2. *For $g \geq 1$ there exists an infinite class $\mathcal{G}_g = \{G_g^k : k \geq 1 \text{ odd}\}$ of spherically embedded graphs of girth and fence-girth g for which the fse-outerplanarity is at least $\frac{k+3}{2} = \frac{n-2}{2g} + \frac{3}{2}$.*

Before giving this proof, we briefly recall the definition of nested cycles. Let $\mathcal{C} = \langle C_0, C_1, \dots, C_k, C_{k+1} \rangle$ be a sequence of disjoint subgraphs in a plane graph G . We call \mathcal{C} *nested cycles* if for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ subgraph C_i is a cycle that contains C_0, \dots, C_{i-1} inside and C_{i+1}, \dots, C_{k+1} outside. Note that C_0 and C_{k+1} need not be cycles.

Proof. The graphs in \mathcal{G}_g consist of nested g -cycles, with singletons as the innermost and outermost ‘cycles’. Formally, define C_i (for $i = 1, \dots, k$) to be a g -cycle, set C_0 and C_{k+1} to be singleton vertices, and arrange C_0, \dots, C_{k+1} as nested cycles to obtain the (disconnected) graph G_k^g with $n_k = gk + 2$ vertices (see Figure 4a).

We claim that G_k^g (for k odd) has at least $\frac{k+3}{2}$ peels regardless of the choice F of the outerface. To see this, let $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ be the index such that F is incident to C_i and C_{i+1} ; up to symmetry we may assume $i \geq k - i$ and therefore

$i \geq \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil = \frac{k+1}{2}$. Let L_1, L_2, \dots be the peels when F is the outerface. Then L_1 contains C_i , but no vertex of $C_0 \cup \dots \cup C_{i-1}$, so we must have at least $i+1$ peels (containing $C_i, C_{i-1}, \dots, C_1, C_0$). Since $k = \frac{n_k-2}{g}$ therefore the number of peels is at least $i+1 \geq \frac{k+3}{2} = \frac{n_k-2}{2g} + \frac{3}{2}$. \square

Theorem 17. *For $g \geq 3$ there exists an infinite class $\mathcal{H}_g = \{H_g^k : k \geq 3 \text{ odd}\}$ of planar graphs of girth and fence-girth g that have outerplanarity at least $\frac{n-2}{2g} + 1 + \frac{3+\chi(g \text{ even})}{2g}$.*

Proof. For $g = 3$ the proof is very easy: Take graph G_k^3 from Lemma 2 and arbitrarily triangulate it while respecting the given spherical embedding. The resulting graph H_k^3 has a unique spherical embedding and requires (for k odd) at least $\frac{n-2}{2g} + \frac{3}{2} = \frac{n-2}{2g} + 1 + \frac{3}{2g}$ peels.

For $g = 4$ graph H_k^4 also extends G_k^4 , but we must be more careful in how to add edges to keep the fence-girth big. Recall that G_k^4 consists of singleton C_0 , 4-cycles C_1, \dots, C_k , and singleton C_{k+1} , arranged as nested cycles. Enumerate each C_i as $\langle u_i, v_i, w_i, x_i \rangle$, where for $i = 0, k+1$ all four names refer to the same vertex. Let H_k^4 be the graph obtained from G_k^4 by adding *connector-edges* (u_i, v_{i+1}) and (w_i, x_{i+1}) for $i = 0, \dots, k$ (see Figure 4b). One easily verifies that H_k^4 is bipartite, hence has fence-girth 4. It also is 2-connected and hence any spherical embedding can be achieved by permuting or flipping the 3-connected components at a cutting pair [13]. But any cutting pair of H_k^4 has only two cut-components (hence we cannot permute), and flipping the components gives the same graph (up to renaming) since H_k^4 is symmetric. Therefore all spherical embeddings of H_k^4 are the same, up to renaming of vertices. Hence for odd k graph H_k^4 has at least $\frac{k+3}{2} = \frac{n-2}{2g} + \frac{3}{2} = \frac{n-2}{2g} + 1 + \frac{3+1}{2g}$ peels in any planar embedding.




Fig. 4: Graphs that have large outerplanarity relative to the fence-girth.

Now consider $g \geq 6$ even, and assume that H_k^{g-2} has been defined already. To obtain H_k^g from it, first extend path C_0 by one vertex, i.e., it becomes a path




Fig. 5: Graphs G_3^4, H_3^4 and H_3^8 .

with $\frac{g-2}{2}$ vertices from $u_0=v_0$ to $w_0=x_0$. Likewise expand path C_{k+1} by one vertex. Finally for $1 \leq i \leq k$, subdivide cycle C_i twice, once on the part between u_i and v_i and once on the part between w_i and x_i . The connector-edges remain unchanged. Construct H_k^{g-1} similarly from H_k^{g-2} : expand paths C_0 and C_{k+1} by one vertex, but subdivide C_i (for $1 \leq i \leq k$) only once, on the part between u_i and v_i . For both g even and odd, graph H_k^g can be obtained by subdividing edges of H_k^4 , hence its outerplanarity cannot be better and is (for k odd) at least $\frac{k+3}{2}$. Since H_k^g has $n = kg + g - 2 + \chi(g)$ (g is odd) vertices, hence its outerplanarity is as desired. It remains to argue the girth, so fix an arbitrary simple cycle C in H_k^g and assume that it visits C_i, \dots, C_j for some $i \leq j$ and no other nested cycles. If $i = j$ then C equals C_i and has length g . If $i < j$, then C uses at least two connector-edges, and parts of C_i and C_j that connect such connector-edges; each such part has length at least $(g-1)/2$ and so $|C| > g$ in this case. So the shortest cycle has length at least g , and this is achieved (and the cycle is a fence) at C_1 . \square

5 Outerplanarity and Diameter

With much the same techniques as for Theorem 15, we can also bound the outerplanarity in terms of the diameter, as long as we permit a ‘correction-term’ of $O(\sqrt{n})$.

Theorem 18. *Any simple plane graph G with $n \geq 14$ vertices has a plane supergraph H with $\text{rad}(H) \leq \lceil \frac{1}{2} \text{diam}(G) \rceil + 2\sqrt{n-4} - 2$.*

Proof. Compute layers L_0, L_1, \dots , augmentation H and the tree of peels \mathcal{T} as in Section 3. If $\text{diam}(\mathcal{T}) = 1$ then \mathcal{T} consists only of root R and its unique child N that stores all vertices of $V(G) \setminus r$; in consequence G has outerplanarity at most $2 \leq 1 + 2\sqrt{n-4} - 1$ by $n \geq 5$. So assume that $\text{diam}(\mathcal{T}) \geq 2$ and let U, V be two nodes of \mathcal{T} with $d_{\mathcal{T}}(U, V) = \text{diam}(\mathcal{T})$. Let S be the node ‘halfway between them’, i.e., of distance $\lceil \text{diam}(\mathcal{T})/2 \rceil$ from U along the unique path from U to V in \mathcal{T} . One easily verifies that $d_{\mathcal{T}}(S, Z) \leq \lceil \text{diam}(\mathcal{T})/2 \rceil$ for all nodes Z of \mathcal{T} ,

otherwise Z would be too far away from either U or V since \mathcal{T} is a tree. Also note that $\text{diam}(\mathcal{T}) \leq \text{diam}(H)$ by Obs. 4(2) and $\text{diam}(H) \leq \text{diam}(G)$ since H is a supergraph. Finally observe that $\mathbf{a}(S) \leq n-4$, for S is an interior node by $\text{diam}(\mathcal{T}) \geq 2$ and stores at least three vertices by simplicity while at least one of U, V is not an ancestor of S and stores at least one vertex.

Pick $s \in S$ arbitrarily. For any $z \in V(G)$ (say z is stored at node Z), we find a path from s to z as follows (see also Figure 3b and 3c): Let A_0 be the least common ancestor of S and Z (quite possibly $A_0 = S$ or $A_0 = Z$). Follow directed edges from s and z to reach vertices $s_0, z_0 \in A_0$; the total number of these edges is $d_{\mathcal{T}}(S, Z) \leq \lceil \frac{1}{2} \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}) \rceil \leq \lceil \frac{1}{2} \text{diam}(G) \rceil$. Observe that $4 \leq \lceil \sqrt{n-4} \rceil$ and also $\sqrt{\mathbf{a}(A_0)} \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{a}(S)} \leq \sqrt{n-4}$. Using Lemma 1 therefore $d_H(s_0, z_0) \leq 2\lceil \sqrt{n-4} \rceil - 2$ and so $d_H(s, z) \leq \lceil \frac{1}{2} \text{diam}(G) \rceil + 2\sqrt{n-4} - 2$. \square

Theorem 18 implies **C3** from the introduction: The fse-outerplanarity of G is at most the fse-outerplanarity of H , which is at most $\text{rad}(H) + 1$. If G is triangulated then necessarily $H = G$ and so $\text{rad}(G) \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{2} \text{diam}(G) \rfloor + O(\sqrt{n})$. Theorem 19 implies that the ‘correction-term’ of $O(\sqrt{n})$ cannot be avoided for the graph in Figure 6.




Fig. 6: Graph H (for $k = 2$) for the proof of Theorem 19, both in a planar drawing and embedded on the triangular prism. Connector-edges are blue/dashed, X_2 is green/bold.

Theorem 19. *For every positive integer k , there exists a triangulated graph G with $n = (3k+1)(3k+2)$ vertices that has diameter at most $3k + 1$ and radius at least $2k = \frac{1}{2} \text{diam}(G) + \Omega(\sqrt{n})$.*

Proof. Let M be the *triangular grid of sidelength $3k$* defined as follows. Each vertex of M corresponds to a point (x, y, z) in \mathbb{Z}^3 that satisfies $x, y, z \geq 0$ and $x + y + z = 3k$. Two such points are connected if and only if their Euclidean distance is $\sqrt{2}$, i.e., one of the three coordinates has changed by $+1$ while another has changed by -1 . Let M' be a second copy of this grid, and add *connector-edges* (v, v') for any $v \in M$ and $v' \in M'$ that have the same coordinates, and

one of these coordinates is 0. We can visualize the resulting graph H as lying on the triangular prism, after omitting the z -coordinates, see also Figure 6. Graph H has $2 \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{3k} (i+1) = (3k+1)(3k+2)$ vertices as desired. It is not quite triangulated; let G be obtained from H by inserting arbitrary diagonals into the quadrangular faces incident to the connector-edges.

Define X_{3k} to be the two vertices with x -coordinate $3k$. For $i = 0, \dots, 3k-1$, consider the set of all vertices that have x -coordinate i , and note that these form a cycle X_i of length $6k - 2i + 2$. Using these cycles, it is very easy to lower-bound the radius. Consider an arbitrary vertex v , say it has coordinates (x, y, z) . Since $x + y + z = 3k$ we may (up to renaming of coordinates) assume that $x \leq k$. Let $w \in X_{3k}$. Then each of the disjoint cycles $X_{k+1}, X_{k+2}, \dots, X_{3k-1}$ contains $v \in X_k$ on one side and $w \in X_{3k}$ on the other. So any path from v to w must contain at least one vertex from each of these cycles, and $d_H(v, w) \geq 2k$. So any vertex has eccentricity at least $2k$, and $\text{rad}(H) \geq 2k$.

Now we upper-bound the diameter. Fix two arbitrary vertices v, v' , and assume that they have x -coordinates i and j respectively; up to renaming $i \leq j$. We can walk from $v \in X_i$ to some vertex $w \in X_j$ in $j - i$ steps, since for all $\ell < 3k$ every vertex in X_ℓ has at least one neighbour in $X_{\ell+1}$. So $d_H(v, w) \leq j - i$. Vertices w and v' both belong to X_j , a cycle of length $6k - 2j + 2$, and hence $d_H(w, v') \leq 3k - j + 1$. Therefore $d_H(v, v') \leq (j - i) + (3k - j + 1) \leq 3k + 1$ and since this holds for all vertex-pairs we have $\text{diam}(H) \leq 3k + 1$. \square

6 Remarks

While the ‘ $\frac{n}{2g}$ ’-part of our bound in Theorem 15 is tight, the ‘ $+2g$ ’ part could use improvement. We can easily prove (with the same techniques as in Theorem 18) a bound of $\frac{n-2}{2g} + O(\sqrt{n})$, but does every planar graph with fence-girth g have outerplanarity $\frac{n}{2g} + O(1)$?

Also, our linear-time algorithm carefully side-steps the question of how to compute the fence-girth (it instead uses a parameter g for which the node-sizes of \mathcal{T} are big enough). Testing whether the fence-girth is at most k is easily done if the spherical embedding is fixed and k is a constant, using the subgraph isomorphism algorithm by Eppstein [16]. But the fence-girth need not be constant and Eppstein’s algorithm does not work if the embedding can be changed. Algorithms to compute the girth [10] do not seem transferrable to the fence-girth. How easy is it to compute the fence-girth, both when the spherical embedding is fixed and when it can be chosen freely?

Acknowledgments

Research by TB supported by NSERC; FRN RGPIN-2020-03958. Research by DM supported by NSERC; FRN RGPIN-2018-05023.

References

1. Alam, M.J., Bläsius, T., Rutter, I., Ueckerdt, T., Wolff, A.: Pixel and voxel representations of graphs. In: Giacomo, E.D., Lubiw, A. (eds.) Proc. of the 23rd International Symposium on Graph Drawing and Network Visualization (GD). LNCS, vol. 9411, pp. 472–486. Springer (2015). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-27261-0_39
2. Ali, P., Dankelmann, P., Mukwembi, S.: The radius of k -connected planar graphs with bounded faces. *Discret. Math.* **312**(24), 3636–3642 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2012.08.019>
3. Baker, B.S.: Approximation algorithms for np-complete problems on planar graphs (preliminary version). In: 24th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Tucson, Arizona, USA, 7-9 November 1983. pp. 265–273. IEEE Computer Society (1983). <https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1983.7>, <https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1983.7>
4. Biedl, T.: On triangulating k -outerplanar graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **181**, 275–279 (2015)
5. Biedl, T., Mondal, D.: Improved outerplanarity bounds for planar graphs. In: Proceedings of the 50th International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science. Springer (1996)
6. Bienstock, D., Monma, C.L.: On the complexity of embedding planar graphs to minimize certain distance measures. *Algorithmica* **5**(1), 93–109 (1990). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01840379>
7. Boitmanis, K., Freivalds, K., Ledins, P., Opmanis, R.: Fast and simple approximation of the diameter and radius of a graph. In: Álvarez, C., Serna, M.J. (eds.) Experimental Algorithms, 5th International Workshop, WEA 2006, Cala Galdana, Menorca, Spain, May 24-27, 2006, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 4007, pp. 98–108. Springer (2006). https://doi.org/10.1007/11764298_9, https://doi.org/10.1007/11764298_9
8. Cabello, S.: Subquadratic algorithms for the diameter and the sum of pairwise distances in planar graphs. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)* **15**(2), 1–38 (2018)
9. Chan, T.M., Skrepetos, D.: Faster approximate diameter and distance oracles in planar graphs. *Algorithmica* **81**(8), 3075–3098 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-019-00570-z>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-019-00570-z>
10. Chang, H., Lu, H.: Computing the girth of a planar graph in linear time. *SIAM J. Comput.* **42**(3), 1077–1094 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1137/110832033>, <https://doi.org/10.1137/110832033>
11. Chepoi, V., Dragan, F.F., Vaxès, Y.: Center and diameter problems in plane triangulations and quadrangulations. In: Eppstein, D. (ed.) Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, January 6-8, 2002, San Francisco, CA, USA. pp. 346–355. ACM/SIAM (2002), <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=545381.545427>
12. Demaine, E.D., Hajiaghayi, M.T., Nishimura, N., Ragde, P., Thilikos, D.M.: Approximation algorithms for classes of graphs excluding single-crossing graphs as minors. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* **69**(2), 166–195 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2003.12.001>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2003.12.001>
13. Di Battista, G., Tamassia, R.: Incremental planarity testing. In: 30th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science. pp. 436–441 (1989)

14. Diestel, R.: Graph Theory, 4th Edition, Graduate texts in mathematics, vol. 173. Springer (2012)
15. Dolev, D., Leighton, F.T., Trickey, H.: Planar embedding of planar graphs. Tech. rep., Massachusetts Inst of Tech Cambridge lab for Computer Science (1983)
16. Eppstein, D.: Subgraph isomorphism in planar graphs and related problems. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.* **3**(3), 1–27 (1999). <https://doi.org/10.7155/jgaa.00014>, <https://doi.org/10.7155/jgaa.00014>
17. Eppstein, D.: Diameter and treewidth in minor-closed graph families. *Algorithmica* **27**(3), 275–291 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004530010020>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004530010020>
18. Gawrychowski, P., Kaplan, H., Mozes, S., Sharir, M., Weimann, O.: Voronoi diagrams on planar graphs, and computing the diameter in deterministic $\tilde{O}(n^{5/3})$ time. *SIAM J. Comput.* **50**(2), 509–554 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1137/18M1193402>
19. Giacomo, E.D., Didimo, W., Liotta, G., Meijer, H.: Computing radial drawings on the minimum number of circles. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.* **9**(3), 365–389 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.7155/jgaa.00114>
20. Grohe, M.: Local tree-width, excluded minors, and approximation algorithms. *Comb.* **23**(4), 613–632 (2003). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00493-003-0037-9>, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00493-003-0037-9>
21. Hajiaghayi, M.T., Nishimura, N., Ragde, P., Thilikos, D.M.: Fast approximation schemes for k_3 , 3-minor-free or k_5 -minor-free graphs. *Electron. Notes Discret. Math.* **10**, 137–142 (2001). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-0653\(04\)00379-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-0653(04)00379-8), [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-0653\(04\)00379-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-0653(04)00379-8)
22. Harant, J.: An upper bound for the radius of a 3-connected planar graph with bounded faces. *Contemporary methods in graph theory (Bibliographisches Inst., Mannheim, 1990)* **353**, 358 (1990)
23. Kammer, F.: Determining the smallest k such that G is k -outerplanar. In: Arge, L., Hoffmann, M., Welzl, E. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 15th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA)*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 4698, pp. 359–370. Springer (2007)
24. Leiserson, C.E.: Area-efficient graph layouts (for VLSI). In: *21st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. pp. 270–281. IEEE Computer Society (1980)
25. Lipton, R., Tarjan, R.: A separator theorem for planar graphs. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **36**(2), 177–189 (1979)
26. Pramanik, T., Mondal, S., Pal, M.: The diameter of an interval graph is twice of its radius. *International Journal of Mathematical and Computational Sciences* **5**(8), 1412 – 1417 (2011)
27. Shook, J.M., Wei, B.: A characterization of the centers of chordal graphs. arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.00039 (2022)
28. username ‘verifying’ (<https://mathoverflow.net/users/82650/verifying>) : Diameter vs radius in maximal planar graphs. *MathOverflow* <https://mathoverflow.net/questions/227888/diameter-vs-radius-in-maximal-planar-graphs> (2013), online; accessed June 19, 2023
29. Weimann, O., Yuster, R.: Approximating the diameter of planar graphs in near linear time. *ACM Trans. Algorithms* **12**(1), 12:1–12:13 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2764910>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/2764910>
30. Wulff-Nilsen, C.: Wiener Index, Diameter, and Stretch Factor of a Weighted Planar Graph in Subquadratic Time. Ph.D. thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Copenhagen (2008)

31. Zhang, H., He, X.: Visibility representation of plane graphs via canonical ordering tree. *Inf. Process. Lett.* **96**(2), 41–48 (2005)