

Weakly Leveled Planarity with Bounded Span

Michael Bekos ✉ 

University of Ioannina, Greece

Giordano Da Lozzo ✉ 


Roma Tre University, Italy

Fabrizio Frati ✉ 

Roma Tre University, Italy

Siddharth Gupta ✉ 

BITS Pilani, K K Birla Goa Campus, India

Philipp Kindermann ✉ 


Trier University, Germany

Giuseppe Liotta ✉ 

Perugia University, Italy

Ignaz Rutter ✉ 

University of Passau, Germany

Ioannis G. Tollis ✉ 

University of Crete, Greece

Abstract

This paper studies planar drawings of graphs in which each vertex is represented as a point along a sequence of horizontal lines, called levels, and each edge is either a horizontal segment or a strictly y -monotone curve. A graph is s -span weakly leveled planar if it admits such a drawing where the edges have span at most s ; the span of an edge is the number of levels it touches minus one. We investigate the problem of computing s -span weakly leveled planar drawings from both the computational and the combinatorial perspectives. We prove the problem to be para-NP-hard with respect to its natural parameter s and investigate its complexity with respect to widely used structural parameters. We show the existence of a polynomial-size kernel with respect to vertex cover number and prove that the problem is FPT when parameterized by treedepth. We also present upper and lower bounds on the span for various graph classes. Notably, we show that cycle trees, a family of 2-outerplanar graphs generalizing Halin graphs, are $\Theta(\log n)$ -span weakly leveled planar and 4-span weakly leveled planar when 3-connected. As a byproduct of these combinatorial results, we obtain improved bounds on the edge-length ratio of the graph families under consideration.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Fixed parameter tractability; Theory of computation → Computational geometry; Mathematics of computing → Graph algorithms

Keywords and phrases Leveled planar graphs, edge span, graph drawing, edge-length ratio

Funding Research by Da Lozzo, Frati, and Liotta was supported, in part, by MUR of Italy (PRIN Project no. 2022ME9Z78 – NextGRAAL and PRIN Project no. 2022TS4Y3N – EXPAND). Research by Liotta was also supported in part by MUR PON Proj. ARS01_00540. Research by Rutter was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – 541433306.

Acknowledgements This work started at the Graph and Network Visualization Workshop 2023 (GNV '23), 25 - 30 June, Chania.

1 Introduction


Computing crossing-free drawings of planar graphs is at the heart of Graph Drawing. Indeed, since the seminal papers by Fáry [42] and by Tutte [57] were published, a rich body of literature

has been devoted to the study of crossing-free drawings of planar graphs that satisfy a variety of optimization criteria, including the area [29, 48], the angular resolution [40, 51], the face convexity [15, 16, 26], the total edge length [55], and the edge-length ratio [13, 17, 18]; see also [30, 56].

In this paper, we focus on crossing-free drawings where the edges are represented as simple Jordan arcs and have the additional constraint of being *y-monotone*, that is, traversing each edge from one end-vertex to the other one, the *y*-coordinates never increase or never decrease. This leads to a generalization of the well-known *layered drawing* style [19, 20, 34], where vertices are assigned to horizontal lines, called *levels*, and edges only connect vertices on different levels. We also allow edges between vertices on the same level and seek for drawings of *bounded span*, i.e., in which the edges span few levels. In their seminal work [43], Heath and Rosenberg study *leveled planar drawings*, i.e., in which edges only connect vertices on consecutive levels and no two edges cross. We also mention the algorithmic framework by Sugiyama et al. [54], which yields layered drawings for the so-called hierarchical graphs. In this framework, edges that span more than one level are transformed into paths by inserting a dummy vertex for each level they cross. Hence minimizing the edge span (or equivalently, the number of dummy vertices along the edges) is a relevant optimization criterion.

Inspired by these works, we study *s-span weakly leveled planar drawings*, which are crossing-free *y*-monotone drawings in which each edge touches at most $s + 1$ levels; see Fig. 1. Note that 1-span weakly leveled planar drawings have been studied in different contexts; for example, Bannister et al. [3] prove that graphs that admit such drawings have layered pathwidth at most two¹. Felsner et al. [37, 38] show that every outerplanar graph has a 1-span weakly leveled planar drawing and use this to compute a 3D drawing of the graph in linear volume; a similar construction by Dujmović et al. [36] yields a 2-span leveled planar drawing for every outerplanar graph, which can be used to bound the queue number [43] of these graphs. In general, our work also relates to track layouts [36] and to the recently-introduced layered decompositions [35], but in contrast to these research works we insist on planarity.

Our contributions. We address the problem of computing a weakly leveled planar drawing with bounded span both from the complexity and from the combinatorial perspectives. Specifically, the *s*-SPAN (WEAKLY) LEVELED PLANARITY problem asks whether a graph admits a (weakly) leveled planar drawing where the span of every edge is at most s . The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows.



■ **Figure 1** A 1-span weakly leveled planar drawing of the Frucht graph (left) and a 4-span weakly leveled planar drawing of the Goldner-Harary graph (right).

¹Bannister et al. use the term weakly leveled planar drawing to mean 1-span weakly leveled planar drawing. We use a different terminology because we allow edges which can span more than one level.

- In [Section 3](#), we show that the s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY problem is NP-complete for any fixed $s \geq 1$ ([Theorem 3](#)). Our proof technique implies that s -SPAN LEVELED PLANARITY is also NP-complete. This generalizes the NP-completeness result by Heath and Rosenberg [[43](#)] which holds for $s = 1$.
- The para-NP-hardness of s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY parameterized by the span s motivates the study of FPT approaches with respect to structural parameters of the input graph. In [Section 4](#), we show that the s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY problem has a kernel of polynomial size when parameterized by vertex cover number ([Theorem 6](#)) and has a (non-polynomial) kernel when parameterized by treedepth ([Theorem 9](#)). As also pointed out in [[58](#)], designing FPT algorithms parameterized by structural parameters bounded by the vertex cover number, such as the treedepth, pathwidth, and treewidth is a challenging research direction in the context of graph drawing (see, e.g., [[1,4–9,23,44,47](#)]). Again, our algorithms can also be adapted to work for s -SPAN LEVELED PLANARITY.
- In [Section 5](#), we give combinatorial bounds on the span of weakly leveled planar drawings of various graph classes. It is known that outerplanar graphs admit weakly leveled planar drawings with span 1 [[38](#)]. We extend the investigation by considering both graphs with outerplanarity 2 and graphs with treewidth 2. We prove that some 2-outerplanar graphs require a linear span ([Theorem 10](#)). Since Halin graphs (which have outerplanarity 2) admit weakly leveled planar drawings with span 1 [[2,32](#)], we consider 3-connected cycle-trees [[24,28](#)], which also have outerplanarity 2 and include Halin graphs as a subfamily. Indeed, while the Halin graphs are those graphs of polyhedra containing a face that shares an edge with every other face, the 3-connected cycle-trees are the graphs of polyhedra containing a face that shares a vertex with every other face. We show that 3-connected cycle-trees have weakly leveled planar drawings with span 4, which is necessary in the worst case ([Theorem 11](#)). For general cycle-trees, we prove $\Theta(\log n)$ span ([Theorem 14](#)); such a difference between the 3-connected and 2-connected case was somewhat surprising for us. Concerning graphs of treewidth 2, we prove an upper bound of $O(\sqrt{n})$ and a lower bound of $2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$ on the span of their weakly leveled planar drawings ([Theorem 15](#)).

Remarks. Dujmović et al. [[34](#)] present an FPT algorithm to minimize the number of levels in a leveled planar graph drawing, where the parameter is the total number of levels. They claim that they can similarly get an FPT algorithm that minimizes the span in a leveled planar graph drawing, where the parameter is the span. Our algorithm differs from the one of Dujmović et al. [[34](#)] in three directions: (i) We optimize the span of a weakly level planar drawing, which is not necessarily optimized by minimizing the span of a leveled planar drawing; (ii) we consider structural parameters rather than a parameter of the drawing; one common point of our three algorithms is to derive a bound on the span *from* the bound on the structural parameter; and (iii) our algorithms perform conceptually simple kernelizations, while the one in [[34](#)] exploits a sophisticated dynamic programming on a path decomposition of the input graph.

Concerning the combinatorial contribution, a byproduct of our results implies new bounds on the planar edge-length ratio [[45,49,50](#)] of families of planar graphs. The planar edge-length ratio of a planar graph is the minimum edge-length ratio (that is, the ratio of the longest to the shortest edge) over all planar straight-line drawings of the graph. Borrazzo and Frati [[18](#)] have proven that the planar edge-length ratio of an n -vertex 2-tree is $O(n^{0.695})$. [Theorem 15](#), together with a result relating the span of a weakly leveled planar drawing to its edge-length

ratio [32, Lemma 4] lowers the upper bound of [18] to $O(\sqrt{n})$ (Corollary 16). We analogously get an upper bound of 9 on the edge-length ratio of 3-connected cycle-trees (Corollary 13).

2 Preliminaries

In the paper, we only consider simple connected graphs, unless otherwise specified. We use standard terminology in the context of graph theory [33] and graph drawing [30].

A *plane graph* is a planar graph together with a *planar embedding*, which is an equivalence class of planar drawings, where two drawings are equivalent if they have the same clockwise order of the edges incident to each vertex and order of the vertices along the outer face.

A graph drawing is *y-monotone* if each edge is drawn as a strictly *y-monotone* curve and *weakly y-monotone* if each edge is drawn as a horizontal segment or as a strictly *y-monotone* curve. For a positive integer k , we denote by $[k]$ the set $\{1, \dots, k\}$. A *leveling* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a function $\ell: V \rightarrow [k]$. A leveling ℓ of G is *proper* if, for any edge $(u, v) \in E$, it holds $|\ell(u) - \ell(v)| = 1$, and it is *weakly proper* if $|\ell(u) - \ell(v)| \leq 1$. For each $i \in [k]$, we define $V_i = \ell^{-1}(i)$ and call it the *i-th level* of ℓ . The *height* of ℓ is $h(\ell) = \max_{v \in V} \ell(v) - \min_{v \in V} \ell(v)$. A *level graph* is a pair (G, ℓ) , where G is a graph and ℓ is a leveling of G . A *(weakly) level planar drawing* of a level graph (G, ℓ) is a planar (weakly) *y-monotone* drawing of G where each vertex is drawn with *y-coordinate* $\ell(v)$. A level graph (G, ℓ) is *(weakly) level planar* if it admits a (weakly) level planar drawing. A (weakly) leveled planar drawing of a graph G is a (weakly) level planar drawing of a level graph (G, ℓ) , for some leveling ℓ of G .

The following observation rephrases a result of Di Battista and Nardelli [31, Lemma 1] in the weakly-level planar setting.

► **Observation 1.** *Let (G, ℓ) be a level graph such that ℓ is (weakly) proper. For each $i \in [k]$, let \prec_i be a linear ordering on $\ell^{-1}(i)$. Then, there exists a (weakly) level planar drawing of (G, ℓ) that respects \prec_i (i.e., in which the left-to-right ordering of the vertices in $\ell^{-1}(i)$ is \prec_i) if and only if: (i) if $(u, v) \in E(G)$ with $\ell(u) = \ell(v) = i$, then u and v are consecutive in \prec_i ; and (ii) if (u, v) and (w, x) are two independent edges (i.e., $\{u, v\} \cap \{w, x\} = \emptyset$) with $\ell(u) = \ell(w) = i$, $\ell(v) = \ell(x) = i + 1$, and $u \prec_i w$, then $v \prec_{i+1} x$.*

The *span* of an edge (u, v) of a level graph (G, ℓ) is $\text{span}_\ell(u, v) = |\ell(u) - \ell(v)|$. The *span* of a leveling ℓ of G is $\text{span}(\ell) = \max_{(u, v) \in E} \text{span}_\ell(u, v)$. Given a graph G , we consider the problem of finding a leveling ℓ that minimizes $\text{span}(\ell)$ among all levelings where (G, ℓ) is weakly level planar. Specifically, given a positive integer s , we call *s-SPAN (WEAKLY) LEVELED PLANARITY* the problem of testing whether a graph G admits a leveling ℓ , with $\text{span}(\ell) \leq s$, such that (G, ℓ) is (weakly) level planar. The 1-SPAN LEVELED PLANARITY problem has been studied under the name of LEVELED PLANAR by Heath and Rosenberg [43].

A (weakly) *y-monotone* drawing Γ of a graph defines a leveling ℓ , called the *associated leveling* of Γ , where vertices with the same *y-coordinate* are assigned to the same level and the levels are ordered by increasing *y-coordinates* of the vertices they contain. Thus, the span of an edge (u, v) in Γ is $\text{span}_\ell(u, v)$, the span of Γ is $\text{span}(\ell)$, and the height of Γ is $h(\ell)$.

The following lemma appears implicitly in the proof of Lemma 4 in [32].

► **Lemma 2.** *Any graph that admits an s -span weakly leveled planar drawing with height h has an $(2s + 1)$ -span leveled planar drawing with height $2h + 1$.*

A planar drawing of a graph is *outerplanar* if all the vertices are external, and *2-outerplanar* if removing the external vertices yields an outerplanar drawing. A graph is *outerplanar (2-outerplanar)* if it admits an outerplanar drawing (resp. 2-outerplanar drawing). A *2-outerplane*

graph is a 2-outerplanar graph with an associated planar embedding which corresponds to 2-outerplanar drawings. A *cycle-tree* is a 2-outerplane graph such that removing the external vertices yields a tree. A *Halin graph* is a 3-connected plane graph G such that removing the external edges yields a tree whose leaves are exactly the external vertices of G (and whose internal vertices have degree at least 3). Note that Halin graphs form a subfamily of the cycle-trees.

3 NP-completeness

This section is devoted to the proof of the following result.

► **Theorem 3.** *For any fixed $s \geq 1$, s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY is NP-complete.*



Proof sketch. The NP-membership is trivial. We prove the NP-hardness via a linear-time reduction from the 1-SPAN LEVELED PLANARITY problem, which was proved NP-complete by Heath and Rosenberg [43]. We distinguish based on whether $s = 1$ or $s > 1$.

(**Case $s = 1$**) Starting from a (bipartite) planar graph H , we construct a graph G that is a positive instance of 1-SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY if and only if H is a positive instance of 1-SPAN LEVELED PLANARITY, by replacing each edge (u, v) of H with a copy $K(u, v)$ of $K_{2,4}$, where u and v are identified with the two degree-4 vertices of $K(u, v)$.

Suppose first that H admits a leveling ℓ_H in $k = h(\ell_H) + 1$ levels, with $\text{span}(\ell_H) \leq 1$, such that (H, ℓ_H) is level planar, and let Γ_H be a level planar drawing of (H, ℓ_H) . Consider the leveling ℓ_G of G on $2k$ levels computed as follows. For each vertex $w \in V(H)$, we set $\ell_G(w) = 2 \cdot \ell_H(w)$. For each vertex $w \in V(G) \setminus V(H)$ in a graph $K(u, v)$, we set $\ell_G(w) = \min\{\ell_G(u), \ell_G(v)\} + 1$. By construction, ℓ_G is proper (and thus $\text{span}(\ell_G) \leq 1$), the vertices of $V(H)$ are assigned to even levels, and the vertices in $V(G) \setminus V(H)$ are assigned to odd levels. The graph $K(u, v)$ admits a leveled planar drawing with span 1 on three levels in which u and v lie strictly above and strictly below all other vertices of $K(u, v)$, respectively. This allows us to introduce a new level between any two consecutive levels in Γ_H and replace the drawing of each edge (u, v) of H with a drawing of $K(u, v)$ as the one described above. The resulting drawing is a level planar drawing Γ_G of (G, ℓ_G) .

Suppose now that G admits a leveling ℓ_G , with $\text{span}(\ell_G) \leq 1$, such that (G, ℓ_G) is weakly level planar. We show that H admits a leveling ℓ_H , with $\text{span}(H) = 1$, such that (H, ℓ_H) is level planar. Note that any 1-span weakly leveled planar drawing of $K(u, v)$ is leveled planar and places u and v on different levels. Also, any edge of G belongs to $K(u, v)$ for some edge $(u, v) \in E(H)$. Thus, any 1-span weakly leveled planar drawing of G is leveled planar. Moreover, ℓ_G is proper. Let Γ_G be a level planar drawing of (G, ℓ_G) . To construct a level planar drawing Γ_H of (H, ℓ_H) , we simply set the ordering of the vertices on level i in Γ_H to be the ordering of these vertices on level $2i$ in Γ_G . We claim that such orderings satisfy Conditions (i) and (ii) of [Observation 1](#), which proves that Γ_H is level planar.

(**Case $s > 1$**) In our proof, we exploit special graphs $W_{i,h}$, with $1 \leq h < i$, having two designated vertices ν and σ , called *poles*; specifically, ν is the *north pole* and σ is the *south pole* of $W_{i,h}$; refer to [Fig. 2](#). In the following, we denote by $K_{2,\alpha}^+$ the graph obtained from the complete bipartite graph $K_{2,\alpha}$ by adding an edge between the two vertices t and b of the size-2 bipartition class of the vertex set of $K_{2,\alpha}$. For any $i \geq 2$, the graphs $W_{i,h}$ are defined as follows. If $h = 1$, the graph $W_{i,1}$ coincides with $K_{2,2i+1}^+$; see [Fig. 2a](#). If $h > 1$, the graph $W_{i,h}$ is obtained from $K_{2,2i+1}^+$ by removing each edge (t, x) , with $x \neq b$, and by identifying t and b with the north and south pole of a copy of $W_{i,h-1}$, respectively; see [Fig. 2b](#).

(a) The graphs $W_{2,1}$ (left) and $W_{3,1}$ (right).(b) The graph $W_{3,2}$. The seven green shaded regions are copies of $W_{3,1}$.

■ **Figure 2** Illustration for the construction of graphs $W_{i,h}$. Pole vertices are white filled.

The reduction for $s > 1$ is similar to the one for $s = 1$, but the role of $K_{2,4}$ is now played by $W_{s,s-1}$. For an edge $(u, v) \in E(H)$, we denote by $W_s(u, v)$ the copy of $W_{s,s-1}$ used to replace (u, v) . The correctness of the reduction is based on the following claims.

▷ **Claim 4.** For any $i \geq 2$ and $h < i$, the graph $W_{i,h}$ admits a levelled planar drawing with span $h + 1$ in which the north pole of $W_{i,h}$ lies strictly above all the other vertices of $W_{i,h}$ and the south pole of $W_{i,h}$ lies strictly below all the other vertices of $W_{i,h}$.

▷ **Claim 5.** For any $i \geq 2$ and $h < i$, in any weakly levelled planar drawing of $W_{i,i-1}$ with span at most i , the edge connecting the poles of $W_{i,i-1}$ has span i .

We conclude the proof by observing that the construction of G can be done in polynomial time, for any fixed value of s ; in particular, the number of vertices of G is bounded by the number of vertices of H times a computable function only depending on s . ◀

The proof of [Theorem 3](#) also shows that, for any fixed $s \geq 1$, deciding whether a graph admits a (non-weakly) levelled planar drawing with span at most s is NP-complete, which generalizes the NP-completeness result by Heath and Rosenberg [43], which is limited to $s = 1$.

4 Parameterized Complexity

Motivated by the NP-hardness of the s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELLED PLANARITY problem ([Theorem 3](#)), we consider the parameterized complexity of the problem. Recall that a problem \mathcal{P} whose input is an n -vertex graph G is *fixed-parameter tractable* (for short, *FPT*) with respect to some parameter k if it can be solved via an algorithm with running time $O(f(k) \cdot p(n))$, where f is a computable function and p is a polynomial function. A *kernelization* for \mathcal{P} is an algorithm that constructs in polynomial time (in n) an instance (G', k') , called *kernel*, such that: (i) the *size* of the kernel, i.e., the number of vertices in G' , is some computable function of k ; (ii) (G', k') and (G, k) are equivalent instances; and (iii) k' is some computable function of k . If \mathcal{P} admits a kernel w.r.t. some parameter k , then it is FPT w.r.t. k .

► **Theorem 6.** *Let (G, s) be an instance of s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY with a vertex cover C of size k . There exists a kernelization that applied to (G, s) constructs a kernel of size $O(k^2)$. Hence, the problem is FPT with respect to the size of a vertex cover.*

Proof sketch. First, we give a kernel (with respect to a parameterization by k and s) of size $O(k \cdot s)$. Second, we show that any planar graph G with vertex cover number k admits a weakly leveled planar drawing with span at most $3k$, which allows us to assume $s \leq 3k$.

For the kernel with respect to $k + s$, we follow a classical reduction approach. By planarity, the number of vertices of $G - C$ with three or more neighbors in C can be bounded by $2k$ (e.g., using [39, Lemma 13.3]), and the number of pairs from C with a degree-2 neighbor in $G - C$ is at most $3k$. For each vertex $c \in C$ with more than three degree-1 neighbors in $G - C$, we only keep three of such neighbors. Then in any drawing of the reduced instance, a neighbor v_c of c is not on the same level as c , and thus we can reinsert the removed vertices next to v_c . Also, for each pair of vertices $\{c, d\} \in C$ that are common neighbors of more than $4s + 5$ degree-2 vertices in $G - C$, we only keep $4s + 5$ of such degree-2 vertices. Then in any drawing of the reduced instance with span at most s , a neighbor v_{cd} of c and d lies strictly between the levels of c and d , and thus we can reinsert the removed vertices next to v_{cd} . As these reductions can be performed in polynomial time, this yields a kernel of size $O(k \cdot s)$.

To bound the span, we consider a more strict trimming operation that removes all degree-1 vertices of $G - C$ and replaces all degree-2 vertices of $G - C$ with the same two neighbors $u, v \in C$ by a single edge (u, v) . As above, the size of this trimmed graph is $O(k)$. It therefore admits a planar leveled drawing of height (and thus also span) $O(k)$, into which the removed vertices can be inserted without asymptotically increasing the height. ◀

Let (G, s) be an instance of s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY and b be a parameter. A set M of vertices of G is a *modulator to components of size b* (*b -modulator* for short) if every connected component of $G - M$ has size at most b . Note that a 1-modulator is a vertex cover. We show that testing whether a graph with a b -modulator of size k admits a weakly leveled planar drawing with span s is FPT w.r.t. $b + k$. The neighbors in M of a component C of $G - M$ are its *attachments*, and are denoted by $\text{att}(C)$. We also denote by $\text{bridge}(C)$ the graph consisting of C , $\text{att}(C)$, and the edges between C and its attachments.

We generalize the technique for vertex cover and give a kernel with respect to $b + k + s$ and further show that any planar graph admits a leveled planar drawing with height (and hence span) bounded by $(5b + 1)bk$. Hence, s can be bounded by a function of $b + k$, which yields the result. Differently from vertex cover, the components of $G - M$ are not single vertices but have up to b vertices. Nevertheless, we use planarity to bound the number of components with three or more attachments by $2k$ and the number of pairs $\{u, v\} \in M$ that are the attachments of components of $G - M$ by $3k$. The most challenging part is again dealing with the components of $G - M$ with one or two attachments, as their number might not be bounded by any function of $b + k$. Here, the key insight is that, since these components have size at most b , there is only a bounded number of “types” of these components. More precisely, two components C_1, C_2 of $G - M$ that have the same attachments are called *equivalent* if there is an isomorphism between $\text{bridge}(C_1)$ and $\text{bridge}(C_2)$ that leaves the attachments fixed. We use the fact that there is a computable (in fact exponential, see e.g. [25]) function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that the number of equivalence classes is bounded by $f(b)$.

We can show that if an equivalence class of components with one attachment (with two attachments) is sufficiently large, that is, it is at least as large as a suitable function of s and b , then in any leveled planar drawing with bounded span, one such component must be drawn on levels that are all strictly above or all strictly below its attachment (resp. on levels that are

strictly between its two attachments). Then arbitrarily many equivalent components can be inserted into a drawing without increasing its span. This justifies the following reduction rules.

► **Rule 1.** For every vertex $v \in M$, let \mathcal{C}_v be a set containing all and only the equivalent components C of $G - M$ such that $\text{att}(C) = \{v\}$. If $|\mathcal{C}_v| > (4s + 4)b$, then remove all but $(4s + 4)b$ of these components from G .

► **Rule 2.** For every pair of vertices $\{u, v\} \in M$, let \mathcal{C}_{uv} be a set containing all and only the equivalent components C of $G - M$ with $\text{att}(C) = \{u, v\}$. If $|\mathcal{C}_{uv}| > (8s + 8)(b + 1)$, then remove all but $(8s + 8)(b + 1)$ such components from G .

We can now sketch a proof of the following theorem.

► **Theorem 7.** Let (G, s) be an instance of s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY with a b -modulator of size k . There exists a kernelization that applied to (G, s) constructs a kernel of size $O(f(b) \cdot k^2 \cdot b^4)$. Hence, the problem is FPT with respect to $k + b$.

Proof sketch. As mentioned above, the number of components of $G - M$ with three or more attachments is at most $2k$. Rules 1 and 2 bound the number of equivalent components with one and two attachments. The fact that the number of equivalence classes is bounded by $f(b)$ then yields a kernel of size $O(f(b) \cdot k \cdot b^2 \cdot s)$. Note that testing whether two components are equivalent can be reduced to an ordinary planar graph isomorphism problem [46], by connecting each attachment to a sufficiently long path, which forces the isomorphism to leave the attachments fixed. Hence, the described reduction can be performed in polynomial time.

To drop the dependence on s of the kernel size, we prove that every planar graph admits a leveled planar drawing whose height (and hence span) is at most $(5b + 1)bk$. To this end, we use a trim operation that removes all components of $G - M$ with a single attachment and replaces multiple components of $G - M$ with attachments $\{u, v\}$ by a single edge (u, v) . The size of the trimmed graph is at most $(5b + 1)k$, therefore there exists a leveled planar drawing of the trimmed graph whose span is bounded by the same function. Then the removed components, which have size at most b , can be reinserted by introducing b new levels below each level, i.e., the span increases by a linear factor in b . This yields the desired leveled planar drawing with span at most $(5b + 1)bk$ and thus a kernel of the claimed size. ◀


We now move to treedepth. A treedepth decomposition of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a tree T on vertex set V with the property that every edge of G connects a pair of vertices that have an ancestor-descendant relationship in T . The *treedepth* of G is the minimum depth (i.e., maximum number of vertices in any root-to-leaf path) of a treedepth decomposition T of G .

Let td be the treedepth of G and T be a treedepth decomposition of G with depth td . Let r be the root of T . For a vertex $u \in V$, we denote by T_u the subtree of T rooted at u , by V_u the vertex set of T_u , by $d(u)$ the depth of u (where $d(u) = 1$ if u is a leaf and $d(u) = td$ if $u = r$), and by $R(u)$ the set of vertices on the path from u to r (end-vertices included).

As for Theorems 6 and 7, we can show that the instance (G, s) is positive if s is sufficiently large, namely larger than $((5td)^{td} + 1)^{td}$. Hence, we can assume that s is bounded w.r.t. td .

► **Theorem 8.** Every planar graph with treedepth td has a leveled planar drawing of height at most $((5td)^{td} + 1)^{td}$.

Proof sketch. We apply a trimming operation similar to the one described in Theorem 7. The effect of this operation, when applied to a vertex v , is to bound the number of children of v in T by $5td$. Assume that every vertex in $V_v \setminus \{v\}$ has at most $5td$ children. Then $R(v)$ is a vertex set of size at most td and, due to the degree bound, any connected component of



■ **Figure 3** (a) A n -vertex 2-outerplanar graph requiring $\Omega(n)$ span in every weakly leveled planar drawing. (b) An n -vertex 3-connected cycle-tree requiring span 4 in every weakly leveled planar drawing. (c) An n -vertex cycle-tree requiring $\Omega(\log n)$ span in every weakly leveled planar drawing. The graph resulting from the removal of the vertices incident to the outer face is drawn bold.

$G - R(v)$ whose vertices are in V_v has size bounded by $(5td)^{td}$. Similarly as for modulators, we can remove such components with a single attachment and replace multiple components with the same two attachments by an edge. This bounds the degree of v in T to $5td$ ($2td$ for components with three or more attachments and $3td$ for components with two attachments).

We apply this trimming operation in batches. The first batch processes all leaves (which has no effect); each next batch consists of all the vertices whose children are already processed. After at most td batches the whole tree is processed (and in fact reduced to a single vertex by processing the root). We then undo these steps while maintaining a leveled planar drawing. The key point here is that, due to the degree bound, each of the removed components contains at most $(5td)^{td}$ vertices, and we can simultaneously reinsert all removed components at the cost of inserting $(5td)^{td}$ levels below each existing level in the current drawing. Therefore, the number of levels multiplies by $(5td)^{td} + 1$ per batch. ◀

We thus obtain the following.

► **Theorem 9.** *Let (G, s) be an instance of s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY with treedepth td . There exists a kernelization that applied to (G, s) constructs a kernel whose size is a computable function of td . Hence, the problem is FPT with respect to the treedepth.*


Proof sketch. We perform a kernelization with respect to $td + s$. We then apply Theorem 8 to bound the span in terms of treedepth. We use a strategy similar to the one in Theorem 8 for processing the vertices in td batches. However, instead of the trimming operation used there, we use Rules 1 and 2 to bound, for each vertex v , the number of components of $G - R(v)$ whose vertices are in V_v by a function $g(td, s)$. Eventually, we obtain an equivalent instance in which the vertices have their degree bounded by $g(td, s)$ in T . This is the desired kernel. ◀

5 Upper and Lower Bounds

In this section, we establish upper and lower bounds on the span of weakly leveled planar drawings of certain graph classes.

► **Theorem 10.** *There exists an n -vertex 2-outerplanar graph such that every weakly leveled planar drawing of it has span in $\Omega(n)$.*

Proof sketch. The lower bound is provided by the graph G_k of Fig. 3a, which is composed of $k := \lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor$ “1-fused stacked cycles” and introduced by Biedl [10]. It is easy to observe



■ **Figure 4** (a) An almost-3-connected path-tree G , drawn with solid edges. The path-vertices are white and the tree-vertices are black. (b) The path-tree G with root ρ .

that each cycle has an edge that spans two more levels than any edge of a cycle stacked inside it, from which the linear lower bound follows. ◀


There is however a well-studied graph family, the Halin graphs, which have outerplanarity 2 and admit 1-span weakly levelled planar drawings [2, 32]. This motivates the study of cycle-trees [28], a superclass of Halin graphs still having outerplanarity 2. We first consider 3-connected cycle-trees showing a constant span and then extend the study to general cycle-trees. The approach for 3-connected cycle-trees relies on removing an edge from the external face so to obtain a graph for which we construct a suitable decomposition tree. We conclude by discussing the span of weakly levelled planar drawings of planar graphs with treewidth 2.

Path-Trees. A *path-tree* is a plane graph G that can be augmented to a cycle-tree G' by adding the edge $e = (\ell, r)$ in its outer face; see Fig. 4a. W.l.o.g., let ℓ occur right before r in clockwise order along the outer face of G' ; then ℓ and r are the *leftmost* and *rightmost path-vertex* of G , respectively. The external (internal) vertices of G' are *path-vertices* (*tree-vertices*). The tree-vertices induce a tree in G . We can select any tree-vertex ρ incident to the unique internal face of G' incident to e as the *root* of G . Then G is *almost-3-connected* if it becomes 3-connected by adding the edges (ρ, ℓ) , (ρ, r) , and (ℓ, r) , if they are not already part of G . If G is almost-3-connected, the path-vertices induce a path in G .

SPQ-decomposition of path-trees. Let G be an almost-3-connected path-tree with root ρ , leftmost path-vertex λ , and rightmost path-vertex r . We define the *SPQ-decomposition* of G , introduced in [28], which constructs a tree \mathcal{T} , called the *SPQ-tree* of G . The nodes of \mathcal{T} are of three types: *S*-, *P*-, and *Q*-nodes. Each node μ of \mathcal{T} corresponds to a subgraph G_μ of G , called the *pertinent graph* of μ , which is an almost-3-connected rooted path-tree. We denote by ρ_μ the root of G_μ (a tree-vertex), by λ_μ the leftmost path-vertex of G_μ , and by r_μ the rightmost path-vertex of G_μ . To handle the base case, we consider as a path-tree also a graph whose path is the single edge (λ, r) and whose tree consists of a single vertex ρ , possibly adjacent to only one of λ and r . Also, we consider as almost-3-connected a path-tree such that adding (ρ, r) , (ρ, λ) , and (λ, r) , if missing, yields a 3-cycle.

We now describe the decomposition.

- **Q-NODE:** the pertinent graph G_μ of a *Q-node* μ is an almost-3-connected rooted path-tree which consists of ρ_μ , λ_μ , and r_μ . The edge (λ_μ, r_μ) belongs to G_μ , while the edges (ρ_μ, λ_μ) and (ρ_μ, r_μ) may not exist; see Fig. 5(left).



■ **Figure 5** Path-trees corresponding to a Q-node (left), an S-node (middle), and a P-node (right). Dashed edges may or may not belong to G_μ . Shaded triangles represent smaller path-trees G_{ν_i} .

- **S-NODE:** the pertinent graph G_μ of an *S-node* μ is an almost-3-connected rooted path-tree which consists of ρ_μ and of an almost-3-connected path-tree G_ν , where ρ_μ is adjacent to ρ_ν and, possibly, to λ_ν and r_ν . We have that μ has a unique child in \mathcal{T} , namely a node ν whose pertinent graph is G_ν . Further, we have $\lambda_\mu = \lambda_\nu$ and $r_\mu = r_\nu$; see Fig. 5(middle).
- **P-NODE:** the pertinent graph G_μ of a *P-node* μ is an almost-3-connected rooted path-tree which consists of almost-3-connected rooted path-trees $G_{\nu_1}, \dots, G_{\nu_k}$, with $k > 1$. This composition is defined as follows. First, we have $\rho_\mu = \rho_{\nu_1} = \dots = \rho_{\nu_k}$. Second, we have $\lambda_{\nu_i} = r_{\nu_{i-1}}$, for $i = 2, \dots, k$. Third, μ has children ν_1, \dots, ν_k (in this left-to-right order) in \mathcal{T} , where G_{ν_i} is the pertinent graph of ν_i , for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Finally, we have $\lambda_\mu = \lambda_{\nu_1}$ and $r_\mu = r_{\nu_k}$; see Fig. 5(right).

In the following, all considered SPQ-trees are *canonical*, that is, the child of every P-node is an S- or Q-node. For a given path-tree, a canonical SPQ-tree always exists [22].




3-connected Cycle-Trees. Let G be a plane graph with three consecutive vertices u, v, w encountered in this order when walking in clockwise direction along the boundary of the outer face of G . A leveling of G is *single-sink with respect to (u, v, w)* if all vertices of G have a neighbor on a higher level, except for exactly one of $\{u, v, w\}$. A single-sink leveling ℓ with respect to (u, v, w) is *flat* if $\ell(u) < \ell(v) < \ell(w)$ or $\ell(w) < \ell(v) < \ell(u)$; ℓ is a *roof* if $\ell(v) > \ell(u)$ and $\ell(v) > \ell(w)$. Note that a single-sink leveling is necessarily either roof or flat.

Given a single-sink leveling ℓ of G with respect to (u, v, w) , a *good* weakly leveled planar drawing Γ of (G, ℓ) is one with the following properties: **1.** Γ respects the planar embedding of G ; **2.** it holds that $x(u) < x(w)$ in Γ ; and **3.** all vertices of $V(G) \setminus \{u, v, w\}$ are contained in the interior of the bounded region R_{uw} defined by the path (u, v, w) , by the vertical rays starting at u and w , and by the horizontal line $y := \min_{z \in V(G)} \ell(z)$.

Let a and b be two non-zero integers. A good weakly leveled planar drawing Γ of (G, ℓ) is an *(a, b) -flat drawing* if ℓ is flat, $a = \ell(v) - \ell(u)$, and $b = \ell(w) - \ell(v)$; it is an *(a, b) -roof drawing* if ℓ is roof, $a = \ell(v) - \ell(u)$, and $b = \ell(w) - \ell(v)$. Note that, by definition, in an (a, b) -flat drawing we have that a and b are either both positive or both negative, while in an (a, b) -roof drawing a is positive and b is negative.


► **Theorem 11.** *Every 3-connected cycle-tree admits a 4-span weakly leveled planar drawing. Also, for all $n \geq 43$, there exists an n -vertex 3-connected cycle-tree G such that every weakly leveled planar drawing of G has span greater than or equal to 4.*

Proof sketch. We first prove the statement for almost 3-connected path trees. Let G be such a graph and \mathcal{T} be its SPQ-tree with root μ . Let $u = \lambda_\mu$, $v = \rho_\mu$, and $w = r_\mu$. Since removing edges does not increase the span of a weakly leveled planar drawing, we can assume that the edges (u, v) and (v, w) belong to G and that G is internally triangulated. That is, we prove the statement when G is a maximal almost-3-connected path-tree. The proof is based on

(a) A (1,1)-flat weakly levelled planar drawing when μ has an odd (left) or even (right) number of children.(b) A (3,1)-flat weakly levelled planar drawing when μ has an odd (left) or even (right) number of children.■ **Figure 6** Illustrations for the proof of [Theorem 11](#), when μ is a P-node.■ **Figure 7** Illustrations for the proof of [Theorem 11](#), when μ is a Q-node and the height of \mathcal{T} is 0.

recursively constructing a drawing of $G = G_\mu$, where the recursion is on the SPQ-tree \mathcal{T} of G , according to the following case distinction (for details, see [Lemma 37](#) in the appendix).

If μ is a **P-node**, then G_μ has flat levelings ℓ_μ^i for $i = 1, \dots, 4$, with $\text{span}(\ell_\mu^i) \leq 4$, such that (G_μ, ℓ_μ^i) admits a p_i -flat weakly levelled planar drawing with $p_1 = (-1, -1)$, $p_2 = (1, 1)$, $p_3 = (-1, -3)$, and $p_4 = (3, 1)$, see [Fig. 6](#). Let k be the number of children of μ in \mathcal{T} . Each flat leveling ℓ_μ^i is obtained by combining roof levelings for the pertinent graphs of the leftmost (or the rightmost) $k-1$ children of μ with a flat leveling of the pertinent graph of the rightmost (resp. leftmost) child of μ . In particular, the $k-1$ children of μ for which flat levelings are used alternate, in left-to-right order, between (1, -3)-roof drawings and (3, -1)-roof drawings. If μ is a **Q-node**, then G_μ has flat levelings ℓ_μ^i for $i = 1, \dots, 4$, with $\text{span}(\ell_\mu^i) \leq 4$, such that (G_μ, ℓ_μ^i) admits a q_i -flat weakly levelled planar drawing with $q_1 = (1, 1)$, $q_2 = (-1, -1)$, $q_3 = (3, 1)$, and $q_4 = (-1, -3)$. Also, G_μ has roof levelings ℓ_μ^j for $j = 5, 6$, with $\text{span}(\ell_\mu^j) \leq 4$, such that (G_μ, ℓ_μ^j) admits a q_j -roof weakly levelled planar drawing with $q_5 = (1, -3)$ and $q_6 = (3, -1)$, see [Fig. 7](#). Finally, if μ is an **S-node**, then G_μ has the same type of levelings



■ **Figure 8** Illustrations for the proof of [Theorem 11](#), when μ is an S-node.

and weakly leveled planar drawings as in the case in which it is a Q-node, see [Fig. 8](#). Each of such levelings is obtained from a flat leveling of the pertinent graph of the unique child of μ .

For triconnected cycle-trees, we remove an edge e on the outer face, after an augmentation we obtain a (1, 1)-flat weakly leveled planar drawing, and insert back e with span 2.

The proof of the theorem is completed by observing that some 3-connected cycle-trees, like the one in [Fig. 3b](#), require span at least 4. ◀

The approach in the proof of [Theorem 11](#) can be implemented in quadratic time. To get linear time, we can maintain only the order of the vertices on their levels and calculate the exact coordinates at the end of the algorithm.

Similar to [36, Lemma 14], one can prove that s -span weakly leveled planar graphs have queue number at most $s + 1$; see [Lemma 41](#) in the appendix. Thus, we have the following.

► **Corollary 12.** *The queue number of 3-connected cycle-trees is at most 5.*

The *edge-length ratio* of a straight-line graph drawing is the maximum ratio between the Euclidean lengths of e_1 and e_2 , over all edge pairs (e_1, e_2) . The *planar edge-length ratio* of a planar graph G is the infimum edge-length ratio of Γ , over all planar straight-line drawings Γ of G . Constant upper bounds on the planar edge-length ratio are known for outerplanar graphs [50] and for Halin graphs [32]. We exploit the property that graphs that admit s -span weakly leveled planar drawings have planar edge-length ratio at most $2s + 1$ [32, Lemma 4] to obtain a constant upper bound on the edge-length ratio of 3-connected cycle trees.


► **Corollary 13.** *The planar edge-length ratio of 3-connected cycle-trees is at most 9.*

General Cycle-Trees. We now discuss general cycle-trees, for which we can prove a $\Theta(\log n)$ bound on the span of their weakly leveled planar drawings.

► **Theorem 14.** *Every n -vertex cycle-tree has an s -span weakly leveled planar drawing such that $s \in O(\log n)$. Also, there exists an n -vertex cycle-tree such that every weakly leveled planar drawing of G has span in $\Omega(\log n)$.*

Proof sketch. For the lower bound, we observe that some cycle-trees require span $\Omega(\log n)$. Indeed, in any planar drawing of the graph in [Fig. 3c](#), a cycle with 3 vertices contains a complete binary tree with $\Omega(n)$ vertices in its interior. Then the lower bound on the span follows from the fact that any weakly leveled planar drawing Γ of a complete binary tree with $\Omega(n)$ vertices has height $\Omega(\log n)$ (because it has $\Omega(\log n)$ pathwidth [14, 52] and the height of Γ is lower-bounded by a linear lower function of the pathwidth of the tree [34]).

For the upper bound, let G be a connected n -vertex cycle-tree. Let \mathcal{E} be a plane embedding of G in which the outer face is delimited by a walk W , so that removing the vertices of W from G one gets a tree T ; see Fig. 9a. We add the maximum number of edges connecting vertices of W with vertices of W and of T , while preserving planarity, simplicity, and the property that every vertex of W is incident to the outer face; see Fig. 9b.



■ **Figure 9** (a) An embedding \mathcal{E} of a cycle-tree G , where the tree T is represented by bold lines. (b) The augmentation of G ; the added edges are red. The face f of \mathcal{E}_{G_W} is gray. (c) Removing the components of G outside C . (d) Removing the components of G inside C .

We now remove some parts of the graph, so that it turns into a 3-connected cycle-tree H . Let G_W be the subgraph of G induced by the vertices of W and let \mathcal{E}_{G_W} be the restriction of \mathcal{E} to G_W . There is a unique face f of \mathcal{E}_{G_W} that contains T in its interior; let C be the cycle delimiting f . We remove from G the vertices of G_W not in C . The removed vertices induce connected subgraphs of G , called *components of G outside C* ; see Fig. 9c. Also, we remove from G all the vertices of T that have at most one neighbor in C . This results in the removal of subtrees of T , which we call *components of G inside C* ; see Fig. 9d.

We next apply Theorem 11 to construct a weakly leveled planar drawing Λ of H with $O(1)$ span and insert $O(\log n)$ levels between any two consecutive levels of Λ . We use such levels to re-introduce the components of G inside and outside C , thus obtaining a weakly leveled planar drawing of G with $O(\log n)$ span. The components of G inside C are trees that can be drawn inside the internal faces of H with $O(\log n)$ height, while ensuring the required vertex visibilities, via an algorithm similar to well-known tree drawing algorithms [21, 27, 53]. The components of G outside C are outerplanar graphs that can be drawn in the outer face of H with $O(\log n)$ height via a suitable combination of results by Biedl [10, 11]. ◀

Planar Graphs with Treewidth 2. In this section, we show that sub-linear span can be achieved for planar graphs with treewidth 2. Note that this is not possible for planar graphs of larger treewidth, as the graph in Fig. 3a has treewidth three and requires span $\Omega(n)$.

► **Theorem 15.** *Every n -vertex planar graph with treewidth 2 has an s -span weakly leveled planar drawing such that $s \in O(\sqrt{n})$. Also, there exists an n -vertex planar graph with treewidth 2 such that every weakly leveled planar drawing of G has span in $2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$.*

Proof sketch. Biedl [10] proved that every n -vertex planar graph G with treewidth 2 admits a planar y -monotone grid drawing Γ with $O(\sqrt{n})$ height, that is, the drawing touches $O(\sqrt{n})$ horizontal grid lines. Interpreting the placement of the vertices along these lines as a leveling shows that G admits a leveled planar drawing Γ with height, and hence span, $O(\sqrt{n})$.

The lower bound uses a construction by Frati [41]. Note that $2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$ is larger than any poly-logarithmic function of n , but smaller than any polynomial function of n . ◀

Since graphs that admit s -span weakly leveled planar drawings have planar edge-length ratio at most $2s + 1$ [32, Lemma 4], we obtain the following result a corollary of Theorem 15, improving upon a previous $O(n^{0.695})$ bound by Borrizzo and Frati [18]

► **Corollary 16.** *Treewidth-2 graphs with n vertices have planar edge-length ratio $O(\sqrt{n})$.*

6 Open Problems

We studied s -span weakly leveled planar drawings from an algorithmic and a combinatorial perspective. We conclude by listing natural open problems arising from our research:

- Does s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY have a kernel of polynomial size when parameterized by the treedepth? Is the problem FPT with respect to the treewidth?
- Theorem 15 shows a gap between the lower and upper bounds in the span for the family of 2-trees. It would be interesting to reduce and possibly close this gap.
- It would also be interesting to close the gap between the lower bound of $\Omega(\log n)$ [12, 13] and the upper bound of $O(\sqrt{n})$ of Corollary 16 on the edge-length ratio of 2-trees.

References

- 1 Martin Balko, Steven Chaplick, Robert Ganian, Siddharth Gupta, Michael Hoffmann, Pavel Valtr, and Alexander Wolff. Bounding and computing obstacle numbers of graphs. In Shiri Chechik, Gonzalo Navarro, Eva Rotenberg, and Grzegorz Herman, editors, *30th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2022, September 5-9, 2022, Berlin/Potsdam, Germany*, volume 244 of *LIPICs*, pages 11:1–11:13. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ESA.2022.11.
- 2 Michael J. Bannister, William E. Devanny, Vida Dujmović, David Eppstein, and David R. Wood. Track layouts, layered path decompositions, and leveled planarity. *Algorithmica*, 81(4):1561–1583, 2019. doi:10.1007/s00453-018-0487-5.
- 3 Oliver Bastert and Christian Matuszewski. Layered drawings of digraphs. In Michael Kaufmann and Dorothea Wagner, editors, *Drawing Graphs, Methods and Models*, volume 2025 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 87–120. Springer, 1999. doi:10.1007/3-540-44969-8_5.
- 4 Sujoy Bhore, Giordano Da Lozzo, Fabrizio Montecchiani, and Martin Nöllenburg. On the upward book thickness problem: Combinatorial and complexity results. In Helen C. Purchase and Ignaz Rutter, editors, *Graph Drawing and Network Visualization - 29th International Symposium, GD 2021, Tübingen, Germany, September 14-17, 2021, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 12868 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 242–256. Springer, 2021. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-92931-2_18.
- 5 Sujoy Bhore, Giordano Da Lozzo, Fabrizio Montecchiani, and Martin Nöllenburg. On the upward book thickness problem: Combinatorial and complexity results. *Eur. J. Comb.*, 110:103662, 2023. doi:10.1016/J.EJC.2022.103662.
- 6 Sujoy Bhore, Robert Ganian, Fabrizio Montecchiani, and Martin Nöllenburg. Parameterized algorithms for book embedding problems. 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 365–378. Springer, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-35802-0_28.
- 7 Sujoy Bhore, Robert Ganian, Fabrizio Montecchiani, and Martin Nöllenburg. Parameterized algorithms for book embedding problems. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 24(4):603–620, 2020. doi:10.7155/JGAA.00526.
- 8 Sujoy Bhore, Robert Ganian, Fabrizio Montecchiani, and Martin Nöllenburg. Parameterized algorithms for queue layouts. In David Auber and Pavel Valtr, editors, *Graph Drawing and Network Visualization - 28th International Symposium, GD 2020, Vancouver, BC, Canada*,

- September 16-18, 2020, Revised Selected Papers, volume 12590 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 40–54. Springer, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-68766-3_4.
- 9 Sujoy Bhore, Robert Ganian, Fabrizio Montecchiani, and Martin Nöllenburg. Parameterized algorithms for queue layouts. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 26(3):335–352, 2022. doi:10.7155/JGAA.00597.
 - 10 Therese Biedl. Small drawings of outerplanar graphs, series-parallel graphs, and other planar graphs. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 45(1):141–160, 2011. doi:10.1007/s00454-010-9310-z.
 - 11 Therese Biedl. Height-preserving transformations of planar graph drawings. In Christian A. Duncan and Antonios Symvonis, editors, *22nd International Symposium on Graph Drawing, GD 2014, September 24-26, 2014, Würzburg, Germany*, volume 8871 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 380–391. Springer, 2014. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-45803-7_32.
 - 12 Václav Blazej, Jirí Fiala, and Giuseppe Liotta. On the edge-length ratio of 2-trees. In David Auber and Pavel Valtr, editors, *Graph Drawing and Network Visualization - 28th International Symposium, GD 2020, Vancouver, BC, Canada, September 16-18, 2020, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 12590 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 85–98. Springer, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-68766-3_7.
 - 13 Václav Blazj, Jirí Fiala, and Giuseppe Liotta. On edge-length ratios of partial 2-trees. *Int. J. Comput. Geom. Appl.*, 31(2-3):141–162, 2021. doi:10.1142/S0218195921500072.
 - 14 Hans L. Bodlaender. A partial k -arboretum of graphs with bounded treewidth. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 209(1-2):1–45, 1998. doi:10.1016/S0304-3975(97)00228-4.
 - 15 Nicolas Bonichon, Stefan Felsner, and Mohamed Mosbah. Convex drawings of 3-connected plane graphs. In János Pach, editor, *Graph Drawing, 12th International Symposium, GD 2004, New York, NY, USA, September 29 - October 2, 2004, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 3383 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 60–70. Springer, 2004. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-31843-9_8.
 - 16 Nicolas Bonichon, Stefan Felsner, and Mohamed Mosbah. Convex drawings of 3-connected plane graphs. *Algorithmica*, 47(4):399–420, 2007. doi:10.1007/s00453-006-0177-6.
 - 17 Manuel Borrizzo and Fabrizio Frati. On the edge-length ratio of planar graphs. 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 165–178. Springer, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-35802-0_13.
 - 18 Manuel Borrizzo and Fabrizio Frati. On the planar edge-length ratio of planar graphs. *J. Comput. Geom.*, 11(1):137–155, 2020. doi:10.20382/jocg.v11i1a6.
 - 19 Guido Brückner, Nadine Davina Krisam, and Tamara Mchedlidze. Level-planar drawings with few slopes. 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 559–572. Springer, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-35802-0_42.
 - 20 Guido Brückner, Nadine Davina Krisam, and Tamara Mchedlidze. Level-planar drawings with few slopes. *Algorithmica*, 84(1):176–196, 2022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-021-00884-x>, doi:10.1007/S00453-021-00884-X.
 - 21 Timothy M. Chan. Tree drawings revisited. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 63(4):799–820, 2020. doi:10.1007/S00454-019-00106-W.
 - 22 Steven Chaplick, Giordano Da Lozzo, Emilio Di Giacomo, Giuseppe Liotta, and Fabrizio Montecchiani. Planar drawings with few slopes of halin graphs and nested pseudotrees. *Algorithmica*, 86(8):2413–2447, 2024. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-024-01230-7>, doi:10.1007/S00453-024-01230-7.
 - 23 Steven Chaplick, Emilio Di Giacomo, Fabrizio Frati, Robert Ganian, Chrysanthi N. Raftopoulou, and Kirill Simonov. Parameterized algorithms for upward planarity. In Xavier Goaoc and Michael Kerber, editors, *38th International Symposium on Computational Geome-*

- try, *SoCG 2022, June 7-10, 2022, Berlin, Germany*, volume 224 of *LIPICs*, pages 26:1–26:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.SOCG.2022.26.
- 24 Steven Chaplick, Giordano Da Lozzo, Emilio Di Giacomo, Giuseppe Liotta, and Fabrizio Montecchiani. Planar drawings with few slopes of Halin graphs and nested pseudotrees. In Anna Lubiw and Mohammad R. Salavatipour, editors, *17th Algorithms and Data Structures Symposium, WADS 2021, August 9-11, 2021, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada*, volume 12808 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 271–285. Springer, 2021. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-83508-8_20.
 - 25 Guillaume Chapuy, Éric Fusy, Omer Giménez, Bojan Mohar, and Marc Noy. Asymptotic enumeration and limit laws for graphs of fixed genus. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A*, 118(3):748–777, 2011. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcta.2010.11.014>, doi:10.1016/J.JCTA.2010.11.014.
 - 26 Marek Chrobak and Goos Kant. Convex grid drawings of 3-connected planar graphs. *Int. J. Comput. Geom. Appl.*, 7(3):211–223, 1997. doi:10.1142/S0218195997000144.
 - 27 Pierluigi Crescenzi, Giuseppe Di Battista, and Adolfo Piperno. A note on optimal area algorithms for upward drawings of binary trees. *Comput. Geom.*, 2:187–200, 1992. doi:10.1016/0925-7721(92)90021-J.
 - 28 Giordano Da Lozzo, William E. Devanny, David Eppstein, and Timothy Johnson. Square-contact representations of partial 2-trees and triconnected simply-nested graphs. In Yoshio Okamoto and Takeshi Tokuyama, editors, *28th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC 2017, December 9-12, 2017, Phuket, Thailand*, volume 92 of *LIPICs*, pages 24:1–24:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ISAAC.2017.24.
 - 29 Hubert de Fraysseix, János Pach, and Richard Pollack. How to draw a planar graph on a grid. *Combinatorica*, 10(1):41–51, 1990. doi:10.1007/BF02122694.
 - 30 Giuseppe Di Battista, Peter Eades, Roberto Tamassia, and Ioannis G. Tollis. *Graph Drawing: Algorithms for the Visualization of Graphs*. Prentice-Hall, 1999.
 - 31 Giuseppe Di Battista and Enrico Nardelli. Hierarchies and planarity theory. *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern.*, 18(6):1035–1046, 1988. doi:10.1109/21.23105.
 - 32 Emilio Di Giacomo, Walter Didimo, Giuseppe Liotta, Henk Meijer, Fabrizio Montecchiani, and Stephen Wismath. New bounds on the local and global edge-length ratio of planar graphs, 2023. *Proceedings of the 40th European Workshop on Computational Geometry, EuroCG 2024*. arXiv:2311.14634.
 - 33 Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory, 4th Edition*, volume 173 of *Graduate texts in mathematics*. Springer, 2012.
 - 34 Vida Dujmović, Michael R. Fellows, Matthew Kitching, Giuseppe Liotta, Catherine McCartin, Naomi Nishimura, Prabhakar Ragde, Frances A. Rosamond, Sue Whitesides, and David R. Wood. On the parameterized complexity of layered graph drawing. *Algorithmica*, 52(2):267–292, 2008. doi:10.1007/s00453-007-9151-1.
 - 35 Vida Dujmović, Gwenaél Joret, Piotr Micek, Pat Morin, Torsten Ueckerdt, and David R. Wood. Planar graphs have bounded queue-number. *J. ACM*, 67(4):22:1–22:38, 2020. doi:10.1145/3385731.
 - 36 Vida Dujmović, Attila Pór, and David R. Wood. Track layouts of graphs. *Discret. Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 6(2):497–522, 2004. doi:10.46298/DMTCS.315.
 - 37 Stefan Felsner, Giuseppe Liotta, and Stephen K. Wismath. Straight-line drawings on restricted integer grids in two and three dimensions. In Petra Mutzel, Michael Jünger, and Sebastian Leipert, editors, *Graph Drawing, 9th International Symposium, GD 2001 Vienna, Austria, September 23-26, 2001, Revised Papers*, volume 2265 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 328–342. Springer, 2001. doi:10.1007/3-540-45848-4_26.
 - 38 Stefan Felsner, Giuseppe Liotta, and Stephen K. Wismath. Straight-line drawings on restricted integer grids in two and three dimensions. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 7(4):363–398, 2003. doi:10.7155/jgaa.00075.

- 39 Fedor V. Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, Saket Saurabh, and Meirav Zehavi. *Kernelization: Theory of Parameterized Preprocessing*. Cambridge University Press, 2019. doi:10.1017/9781107415157.
- 40 Michael Formann, Torben Hagerup, James Haralambides, Michael Kaufmann, Frank Thomson Leighton, Antonios Symvonis, Emo Welzl, and Gerhard J. Woeginger. Drawing graphs in the plane with high resolution. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 22(5):1035–1052, 1993. doi:10.1137/0222063.
- 41 Fabrizio Frati. Lower bounds on the area requirements of series-parallel graphs. *Discret. Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 12(5):139–174, 2010. doi:10.46298/dmtcs.500.
- 42 István Fáry. On straight lines representation of planar graphs. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)*, 11:229–233, 1948.
- 43 Lenwood S. Heath and Arnold L. Rosenberg. Laying out graphs using queues. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 21(5):927–958, 1992. doi:10.1137/0221055.
- 44 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, September 17-20, 2019, Prague, Czech Republic*, volume 11904 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 307–319. Springer, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-35802-0_24.
- 45 Michael Hoffmann, Marc J. van Kreveld, Vincent Kusters, and Günter Rote. Quality ratios of measures for graph drawing styles. In *26th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry, CCCG 2014, August 11-13, 2014, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada*. Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada, 2014. URL: <http://www.cccg.ca/proceedings/2014/papers/paper05.pdf>.
- 46 John E. Hopcroft and J. K. Wong. Linear time algorithm for isomorphism of planar graphs (preliminary report). In Robert L. Constable, Robert W. Ritchie, Jack W. Carlyle, and Michael A. Harrison, editors, *6th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 1974, April 30 - May 2, 1974, Seattle, Washington, USA*, pages 172–184. ACM, 1974. doi:10.1145/800119.803896.
- 47 Bart M. P. Jansen, Liana Khazaliya, Philipp Kindermann, Giuseppe Liotta, Fabrizio Montecchiani, and Kirill Simonov. Upward and orthogonal planarity are $w[1]$ -hard parameterized by treewidth. In Michael A. Bekos and Markus Chimani, editors, *Graph Drawing and Network Visualization - 31st International Symposium, GD 2023, Isola delle Femmine, Palermo, Italy, September 20-22, 2023, Revised Selected Papers, Part II*, volume 14466 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 203–217. Springer, 2023. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-49275-4_14.
- 48 Goos Kant. Drawing planar graphs using the canonical ordering. *Algorithmica*, 16(1):4–32, 1996. doi:10.1007/BF02086606.
- 49 Sylvain Lazard, William J. Lenhart, and Giuseppe Liotta. On the edge-length ratio of outerplanar graphs. In Fabrizio Frati and Kwan-Liu Ma, editors, *Graph Drawing and Network Visualization - 25th International Symposium, GD 2017, Boston, MA, USA, September 25-27, 2017, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 10692 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 17–23. Springer, 2017. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-73915-1_2.
- 50 Sylvain Lazard, William J. Lenhart, and Giuseppe Liotta. On the edge-length ratio of outerplanar graphs. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 770:88–94, 2019. doi:10.1016/J.TCS.2018.10.002.
- 51 Seth M. Malitz and Achilleas Papakostas. On the angular resolution of planar graphs. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 7(2):172–183, 1994. doi:10.1137/S0895480193242931.
- 52 Petra Scheffler. *Die Baumweite von Graphen als ein Maß für die Kompliziertheit algorithmischer Probleme*. PhD thesis, Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Berlin, 1989.
- 53 Yossi Shiloach. *Linear and Planar Arrangements of Graphs*. PhD thesis, Weizmann Institute of Science, 1976.
- 54 Kozo Sugiyama, Shojiro Tagawa, and Mitsuhiro Toda. Methods for visual understanding of hierarchical system structures. *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern.*, 11(2):109–125, 1981. doi:10.1109/TSMC.1981.4308636.
- 55 Roberto Tamassia. On embedding a graph in the grid with the minimum number of bends. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 16(3):421–444, 1987. doi:10.1137/0216030.

- 56 Roberto Tamassia, editor. *Handbook on Graph Drawing and Visualization*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2013. URL: <https://cs.brown.edu/people/rtamassi/gdhandbook>.
- 57 William Thomas Tutte. How to draw a graph. *Pro. London Math. Society*, 3(1):743–767, 1963.
- 58 Meirav Zehavi. Parameterized analysis and crossing minimization problems. *Comput. Sci. Rev.*, 45:100490, 2022. doi:10.1016/J.COSREV.2022.100490.

A

 Omitted Material from Section 3

► **Theorem 3.** *For any fixed $s \geq 1$, s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELLED PLANARITY is NP-complete.*

Proof. The NP-membership is trivial. In fact, given a graph G , a non-deterministic Turing machine can guess in polynomial time all possible levelings of the vertices of G to up to $s(n-1)+1$ levels. Moreover, for each of such levelings ℓ , in deterministic polynomial time, it is possible to test whether $\text{span}(\ell) \leq s$ and whether the level graph (G, ℓ) is level planar [17]

Throughout, given a leveling ℓ_Q or a graph Q and a (weakly) level planar drawing Γ_Q of the level graph (Q, ℓ_Q) , we note by \prec_i^Q the left-to-right order of the vertices of $\ell^{-1}(i)$ in Γ_Q , with $i \in [h(\ell)+1]$.

To prove the NP-hardness, we distinguish two cases, based on whether $s = 1$ or $s > 1$. In both cases, we exploit a linear-time reduction from the LEVELED PLANAR problem, which was proved NP-complete by Heath and Rosenberg [15]. Recall that, given a planar bipartite graph H , the LEVELED PLANAR problem asks to determine whether H admits 1-span leveling ℓ_H such that (H, ℓ_H) is level planar. In other words, the LEVEL PLANAR problem coincides with 1-SPAN LEVELED PLANARITY.

(**Case $s = 1$**). Note that, a 1-span leveled planar graph must be bipartite. Starting from a bipartite planar graph H , we construct a graph G that is a positive instance of 1-SPAN WEAKLY LEVELLED PLANARITY if and only if H is a positive instance of 1-SPAN LEVELED PLANARITY. To this aim, we proceed as follows. We initialize $G = H$. Then, for each edge (u, v) of H , we remove (u, v) from G , introduce a copy $K(u, v)$ of the complete bipartite planar graph $K_{2,4}$, and identify each of u and v with one of the two vertices in the size-2 bipartition class of the vertex set of $K(u, v)$. Clearly, G is planar and bipartite. Moreover, the above reduction can clearly be carried out in polynomial, in fact, linear time.

In the following, for any edge $(u, v) \in E(H)$, we denote the four vertices of the size-4 bipartition class of the vertex set of $K(u, v)$ as x_{uv}, y_{uv}, z_{uv} , and w_{uv} .

Suppose first that H admits a leveling ℓ_H in $k = h(\ell_H) + 1$ levels, with $\text{span}(\ell_H) \leq 1$, such that (H, ℓ_H) is level planar, and let Γ_H be a level planar drawing of (H, ℓ_H) . We show that G admits a leveling ℓ_G on $2k$ levels, with $\text{span}(\ell_G) \leq 1$, such that (G, ℓ_G) is weakly level planar. The leveling ℓ_G is computed as follows. For each vertex $w \in V(H)$, we set $\ell_G(w) = 2 \cdot \ell_H(w)$. For each vertex $w \in V(G) \setminus V(H)$, i.e., $w \in \{x_{uv}, y_{uv}, z_{uv}, w_{uv}\}$ with $(u, v) \in E(H)$, we set $\ell_G(w) = \ell_H(u) + \ell_H(v)$; in this case, $\ell_G(w) = \min\{\ell_G(u), \ell_G(v)\} + 1$, i.e., w is assigned to the level that lies between the levels of u and v in ℓ_G . By construction, ℓ_G is proper (and thus $\text{span}(\ell_G) \leq 1$), the vertices of $V(H)$ are assigned to even levels, and the vertices in $V(H) \setminus V(G)$ are assigned to odd levels.

We show that (G, ℓ_G) is level planar (and thus weakly level planar) by constructing a level planar drawing Γ_G of (G, ℓ_G) . To obtain Γ_G , for each $j \in [2k]$, we set \prec_j^G as follows. If j is even, we set $\prec_j^G = \prec_{\frac{j}{2}}^H$. Instead, if j is odd, we define \prec_j^G as follows. Recall that, the j -th level of ℓ_G , with j odd, only contains vertices $q_{u,v}$ with $q \in \{x, y, z, w\}$, $(u, v) \in E(H)$, and $j = \min(\ell_G(u), \ell_G(v)) + 1$. To obtain \prec_j^G , we first define a total ordering along level j of all vertices $x_{u,v}$, where $(u, v) \in E(H)$ and $j = \min(\ell_G(u), \ell_G(v)) + 1$, and then require that x_{uv}, y_{uv}, z_{uv} , and w_{uv} appear consecutively in \prec_j^G in this left-to-right order. The above total ordering is computed as follows: For every two independent edges (u, v) and (s, t) in $E(H)$ such that $\ell_G(u) = \ell_G(s) = j - 1$, $\ell_G(v) = \ell_G(t) = j + 1$, and (u, v) immediately precedes (s, t) in Γ_H in the left-to-right order of the edges between the $(\frac{j-1}{2})$ -th and the $(\frac{j+1}{2})$ -th level of ℓ_H , we require that $x_{u,v} \prec_j^G x_{s,t}$. We have the following.

► **Claim 17.** The drawing Γ_G of (G, ℓ_G) is level planar.

Proof. It suffices to prove that the orderings \prec_j^G satisfy Conditions (i) and (ii) of [Observation 1](#). By the construction of ℓ_G , we have that no two adjacent vertices of G are assigned to the same level; thus, Condition (i) trivially holds for Γ_G . Further, let (u, a) and (w, b) be two independent edges such that $i = \ell_G(u) = \ell_G(w)$ and $j = \ell_G(a) = \ell_G(b)$. By construction, $a \in \{x_{uv}, y_{uv}, z_{uv}, w_{uv}\}$, for some edge $(u, v) \in E(H)$, and $b \in \{x_{wz}, y_{wz}, z_{wz}, w_{wz}\}$, for some edge $(w, z) \in E(H)$. Assume that $j = i + 1$; the case $j = i - 1$ being symmetric, and assume, w.l.o.g., that $u \prec_i^G w$. Then, by the construction of Γ_G , we have that $u \prec_{\frac{i}{2}}^H w$. In turn, by Condition (ii) for Γ_H , we have that $v \prec_{\frac{i}{2}+1}^H z$. Therefore, by construction of Γ_G , we have that $a \prec_j^H b$, which proves Condition (ii) for Γ_G , and thus concludes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

Suppose now that G admits a leveling ℓ_G , with $\text{span}(\ell_G) \leq 1$, such that (G, ℓ_G) is weakly level planar. We show that H admits a leveling ℓ_H , with $\text{span}(H) = 1$, such that (H, ℓ_H) is level planar. The following property will turn useful.

► Property 18. *Consider the complete bipartite graph $K_{2,4}$ and let u and v be the vertices of the size-2 bipartition class of its vertex set and let x, y, z , and w be the other four vertices. Then, the levelings ℓ with $\text{span}(\ell) \leq 1$ for which $(K_{2,4}, \ell)$ is weakly level planar are such that $\ell(u) = \ell(v) \pm 2$ and $\ell(x) = \ell(y) = \ell(z) = \ell(w) = \frac{\ell(u) + \ell(v)}{2}$.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Let ℓ be a leveling of $K_{2,4}$ such that $\ell(u) = \ell(v) \pm 2$ and $\ell(x) = \ell(y) = \ell(z) = \ell(w) = \frac{\ell(u) + \ell(v)}{2}$. Observe that ℓ is proper and that no two independent edges exist whose endpoints connect the same pair of levels. Therefore, any ordering of the vertices of $K_{2,4}$ along the levels defined by ℓ satisfies Conditions (i) and (ii) of [Observation 1](#), which implies that $(K_{2,4}, \ell)$ is 1-span level planar.



(\Leftarrow) Let now ℓ be a leveling with $\text{span}(\ell) \leq 1$ such that $(K_{2,4}, \ell)$ is weakly level planar. We show that (a) $|\ell(u) - \ell(v)| \leq 2$ and that (b) $|\ell(u) - \ell(v)| > 0$, which imply that $\ell(u) = \ell(v) \pm 2$. Suppose that (a) does not hold. Then, the span of (u, x) , of (x, v) , or both must be larger than 1. Suppose now that (b) does not hold, i.e., u and v are assigned to the same level. Then, by the pigeonhole principle and since $\text{span}(\ell) \leq 1$, we have that one of the levels $\ell(u)$, $\ell(u) + 1$, and $\ell(u) - 1$ must contain two vertices in $\{x, y, z, w\}$, say x and y . The subgraph of $K_{2,4}$ induced by u, v, x, y is a 4-cycle. However, the graphs that admit a leveled planar drawing of two levels are the forests of caterpillars [11], a contradiction. Finally, the fact that all the vertices x, y, w , and x must be assigned in ℓ to the level $\frac{\ell(u) + \ell(v)}{2}$ follows from the fact that $\ell(u) = \ell(v) \pm 2$ and that $\text{span}(\ell) \leq 1$. \blacktriangleleft

Observe that, by [Property 18](#), the levelings ℓ for which $(K_{2,4}, \ell)$ is weakly level planar are proper. Thus, any 1-span weakly leveled planar drawing of $K_{2,4}$ is leveled planar. Also, note that any edge of G belongs to $K(u, v)$ for some edge $(u, v) \in E(H)$. Thus, we immediately get the following.

► Observation 19. *Any 1-span weakly leveled planar drawing of G is leveled planar.*

By [Observation 19](#), we have that ℓ_G is proper. Also by [Observation 19](#) and since G is connected, we have that all and only the vertices of $V(H)$ lie in even levels of ℓ_G . For every vertex v of H , we set $\ell_H(v) = \frac{\ell_G(v)}{2}$. By construction, $\text{span}(\ell_H) = 1$. Let now Γ_G be a (weakly) level planar drawing of (G, ℓ_G) . We show how to construct a level planar drawing Γ_H of (H, ℓ_H) . To construct Γ_H , we simply set $\prec_i^H = \prec_{2i}^G$, for each $i \in [k]$.

\triangleright **Claim 20.** The drawing Γ_H of (H, ℓ_H) is level planar.

(a) The graphs $W_{2,1}$ (left) and $W_{3,1}$ (right).(b) The graph $W_{3,2}$. The seven green shaded regions are copies of $W_{3,1}$.


■ **Figure 10** Illustration for the construction of graphs $W_{i,h}$. Pole vertices are white filled.

Proof. We prove that the orderings \prec_i^H satisfy Conditions (i) and (ii) of [Observation 1](#). By the construction ℓ_H , we have that no two adjacent vertices of H are assigned to the same level; thus, Condition (i) trivially holds for Γ_H . Further, let (u, v) and (w, z) be two independent edges such that $i = \ell_H(u) = \ell_H(w)$ and $\ell_H(v) = \ell_H(z)$. Assume that $\ell_H(v) = \ell_H(u) + 1$; the case in which $\ell_H(v) = \ell_H(u) - 1$ being symmetric, and assume, w.l.o.g., that $u \prec_i^H w$. Then, by construction of Γ_H , we have that $u \prec_{2i}^G w$. In turn, by Condition (ii) for Γ_G , we have that $x_{uv} \prec_{2i+1}^G x_{wz}$, which, again by Condition (ii) for Γ_G , implies that $v \prec_{2(i+1)}^G z$ in Γ_G . The latter and the construction of Γ_H imply that $v \prec_k^H z$, with $k = \frac{2(i+1)}{2} = i + 1$. Thus, Condition (ii) holds for Γ_H , which concludes the proof. ◀

(**Case $s > 1$**). In our proof, we will exploit special graphs $W_{i,h}$, with $1 \leq h < i$, having two designated vertices ν and σ , called *poles*; specifically, ν is the *north pole* and σ is the *south pole* of $W_{i,h}$; refer to [Fig. 10](#). In the following, we denote by $K_{2,\alpha}^+$ the graph obtained from the complete bipartite graph $K_{2,\alpha}$ by adding an edge between the two vertices t and b of the size-2 bipartition class of the vertex set of $K_{2,\alpha}$. We say that t and b are the *extremes* of $K_{2,\alpha}^+$, and we refer to t and to b as the *top* and the *bottom extreme*, respectively. For any $i \geq 2$, the graphs $W_{i,h}$ are defined as follows. We distinguish based on the value of h . If $h = 1$, the graph $W_{i,1}$ coincides with $K_{2,2i+1}^+$; see [Fig. 10a](#). If $h > 1$, the graph $W_{i,h}$ is obtained from $K_{2,2i+1}^+$ by removing each edge (t, x) , with $x \neq b$, and by identifying t and b with the north and south pole of a copy of $W_{i,h-1}$, respectively; see [Fig. 10b](#). We have the following claims.

▷ **Claim 21.** For any $i \geq 2$, the graph $W_{i,h}$ admits a levelled planar drawing with span $h + 1$ in which the north pole of $W_{i,h}$ lies strictly above all the other vertices of $W_{i,h}$ and the south pole of $W_{i,h}$ lies strictly below all the other vertices of $W_{i,h}$.

Proof. We prove the statement by induction on h ; refer to [Fig. 11](#). In the base case $h = 1$, and thus $i \geq 2$. Then, $W_{i,1} = K_{2,2i+1}^+$, which admits a level planar drawing with span $h + 1 = 2$ with the desired properties; see [Fig. 10a](#). In the inductive case $h > 1$. Then, a



■ **Figure 11** Example for the construction of the drawings of $W_{i,h}$ that satisfy [Claim 21](#), with $i = 3$ and $h = 2$. (Left) Initialization of the drawing of $W_{3,2}$ to a straight-line planar drawing of $K_{2,7}^+$. (Right) Replacement of the edges (ν, x) , with $x \neq \sigma$, with a drawing of $W_{3,1}$. For readability purposes, only one edge has been replaced with a drawing of $W_{3,1}$; the other replacements are represented by tailed regions.

drawing Γ of $W_{i,h}$ with the desired properties can be constructed as follows. We initialize Γ to a straight-line planar drawing of $K_{2,2i+1}^+$ in which σ is placed on point $(0,0)$, μ is placed on point $(0, h+1)$, and the remaining $2i+1$ vertices of $K_{2,2i+1}^+$ are placed on points $(j, 1)$, for $j = 1, \dots, 2i+1$; see [Fig. 11](#)(left). Observe that, in Γ , the edge (μ, σ) has span $h+1$, the edges incident to σ and not to μ have span 1, and the edges incident to μ and not to σ have span h . We call the latter edges *long*. By induction, the graph $W_{i,h-1}$ admits a leveled planar drawing Γ' with span h in which the north pole of $W_{i,h-1}$ lies strictly above all the other vertices of $W_{i,h-1}$ and the south pole of $W_{i,h-1}$ lies strictly below all the other vertices of $W_{i,h-1}$. Consider the leveling ℓ' of $W_{i,h-1}$ determined by the y -coordinates of the vertices in Γ' . W.l.o.g., we assume that ℓ' assigns the north and the south pole of $W_{i,h-1}$ to levels $h+1$ and 1, respectively. This allows us to replace the drawing of each long edge (μ, x) (where $x \neq \sigma$ is the south pole of some copy of $W_{i,h-1}$) with a drawing of $W_{i,h-1}$ in which (i) the north pole of $W_{i,h-1}$ lies upon μ and the south pole of $W_{i,h-1}$ lies upon x , and (ii) the vertices of $W_{i,h-1}$ in level i lie arbitrarily close to the intersection point of (μ, x) and the level i , and so that these vertices are consecutive along level i and have the same left-to-right ordering in the resulting drawing as in Γ' . This yields a leveled planar drawing Γ of $W_{i,h}$ with the desired properties. In particular, the span of Γ coincides with the span of the edge (μ, ν) , which is $h+1$. ◀

▷ **Claim 22.** For any $i \geq 2$, in any weakly leveled planar drawing of $W_{i,i-1}$ with span at most i , the edge connecting the poles of $W_{i,i-1}$ has span i .

Proof. We start by establishing the following two useful properties of any weakly leveled planar drawing Γ^* with span at most i of $K_{2,2i+1}^+$.

P1: In Γ^* , the extremes of $K_{2,2i+1}^+$ lie on different levels.

P2: In Γ^* , there exists a vertex x of $K_{2,2i+1}^+$ that lies strictly between the extremes of $K_{2,2i+1}^+$.

We prove **P1**. Similarly as in the proof of [Property 18](#), if the extremes of $K_{2,2i+1}^+$ are assigned to the same level, then by the pigeonhole principle and since $\text{span}(\ell) \leq i$, there must exist two vertices a and b of the above $K_{2,2i+1}^+$ that are assigned to a same level. However, the 4-cycle formed by a , b , and the two extremes of $K_{2,2i+1}^+$ does not admit a level planar drawing with the described level assignment.

We prove **P2**. Suppose, for the sake of a contradiction, that in Γ^* no vertex of $K_{2,2i+1}^+$ lies strictly between the extremes t and b of $K_{2,2i+1}^+$. We call *non-extremal* the vertices of $K_{2,2i+1}^+$

different from t and b . Let ℓ^* be the leveling of $K_{2,2i+1}^+$ determined by Γ^* , and assume, w.l.o.g., that $\ell(t) > \ell(b)$. By hypothesis, ℓ^* assigns each non-extremal vertex v of $K_{2,2i+1}^+$ to a level $\ell(v)$ such that either $\ell(v) \leq \ell(b)$ or $\ell(v) \geq \ell(t)$. However, since $\ell(t) - \ell(b) \geq 1$ by **P1** and since $|\ell(v) - \ell(t)| \leq i$ and $|\ell(v) - \ell(b)| \leq i$ given that Γ^* has span at most i , there exists at most i levels above and including $\ell(t)$ and at most i levels below and including $\ell(b)$ where v may lie in Γ^* . This defines at most $2i$ available levels for the non-extremal vertices of $K_{2,2i+1}^+$. However, since in Γ^* the vertices t and b lie on different levels, the planarity of Γ^* enforces that at most two non-extremal vertices of $K_{2,2i+1}^+$ can lie on the same level in Γ^* . Since there exist $2k + 1$ non-extremal vertices, we get a contradiction.

Consider a weakly leveled planar drawing Γ of $W_{i,i-1}$ with span at most i and let ℓ be the corresponding leveling. Since ν and σ are the extremes of a $K_{2,2i+1}^+$ subgraph of $W_{i,i-1}$, we derive the following. By **P2**, we have that in Γ there exists a vertex x of $W_{i,i-1}$ that lies strictly between the levels of ν and σ . In particular, it holds that $|\ell(\nu) - \ell(x)| \geq 1$ and that $|\ell(\sigma) - \ell(x)| \geq 1$. In turn, this and the fact that $|\ell(\nu) - \ell(\sigma)| = |\ell(\nu) - \ell(x)| + |\ell(\sigma) - \ell(x)|$ imply that $|\ell(\nu) - \ell(\sigma)| \geq |\ell(\nu) - \ell(x)| + 1$. Observe now that μ and x are the poles of a subgraph $= W_{i,i-2}$ of $W_{i,i-1}$, and thus they are also the extremes of a $K_{2,2i+1}^+$ subgraph of W' . Therefore, again by **P2**, we have that there exists a vertex x' of W' that lies strictly between the levels of ν and x . In particular, we get that $|\ell(\nu) - \ell(x)| \geq |\ell(\nu) - \ell(x')| + 1$, which implies that $|\ell(\nu) - \ell(\sigma)| \geq |\ell(\nu) - \ell(x')| + 2$. The repetition of this argument and the construction of $W_{i,i-1}$ imply that $|\ell(\mu) - \ell(\sigma)| \geq |\ell(\nu) - \ell(x^*)| + (i - 1)$, where x^* is a vertex of the “inner most” copy of $K_{2,2i+1}^+$ incident to ν . The fact that $|\ell(\nu) - \ell(x^*)| \geq 1$ implies the statement. \blacktriangleleft

The reduction for $s > 1$ is similar to the one for $s = 1$, but the role of $K_{2,4}$ is now played by $W_{s,s-1}$. Starting from a bipartite planar graph H , we construct a graph G that is a positive instance of s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY if and only if H is a positive instance of 1-SPAN LEVELED PLANARITY. To this aim, we proceed as follows. We initialize $G = H$. Then, for each edge (u, v) of H , we remove (u, v) from G , introduce a copy of $W_{s,s-1}$, which we denote as $W_s(u, v)$, and identify u and v with the poles ν and σ of $W_{s,s-1}$, respectively. Clearly, G is planar and the above reduction can be carried out in polynomial time, since the size of $W_{s,s-1}$ depends only on s .

Suppose that H admits a leveling ℓ_H , with $\text{span}(\ell_H) \leq 1$, such that (H, ℓ_H) is level planar, and let Γ_H be a level planar drawing of (H, ℓ_H) . Then, the leveling ℓ'_H of H where $\ell'_H(v) = s \cdot \ell_H(v)$ is clearly such that (H, ℓ'_H) is level planar and $\text{span}(\ell'_H) \leq s$. In fact, a level planar drawing Γ'_H of (H, ℓ'_H) can be obtained by simply setting the y -coordinate of each vertex v in Γ'_H to be s times the y -coordinate of v in Γ_H .

By **Claim 21**, for each edge (u, v) of H , there exists a leveled planar drawing $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$ of the graph $W_s(u, v)$ with span s in which u lies strictly above all the other vertices of $W_s(u, v)$ and v lies strictly below all the other vertices of $W_s(u, v)$. Note that, by **Claim 22**, the span of the edge (u, v) in $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$ is exactly s . Let ℓ_W be the leveling of $W_s(u, v)$ determined by the y -coordinates of the vertices in $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$. W.l.o.g., we assume that $\ell_W(v) = \ell'_H(v)$.

By construction, each edge (u, v) of H has span s in Γ'_H . This and the properties of $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$ listed above allow us to replace the drawing of each edge (u, v) in Γ'_H with a drawing of $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$ in which (i) the placement of u and v is the same as in Γ'_H , and (ii) the vertices of $W_s(u, v)$ in level i lie arbitrarily close the intersection point in Γ'_H of the edge (u, v) and level i , and so that these vertices are consecutive along level i and have the same left-to-right ordering in the resulting drawing as in $\Gamma_{(u,v)}$. This yields a leveled planar drawing Γ_G of G with span s . In fact, if we subdivide each edge of G with span larger than 1 with a dummy vertex

at its intersection with a level in Γ_G , we obtain a drawing and a proper leveling satisfying [Observation 1](#)).

Suppose now that G admits a leveling ℓ_G , with $\text{span}(\ell_G) \leq s$, such that (G, ℓ_G) is weakly level planar. We show that H admits a leveling ℓ_H , with $\text{span}(\ell_H) \leq 1$, such that (H, ℓ_H) is level planar. Let Γ_G be a straight-line level planar drawing of (G, ℓ_G) ; in this respect, observe that, a level planar drawing is y -monotone, and thus it can be “stretched” into a straight-line planar drawing keeping the y -coordinate of the vertices unchanged [2, 9, 10, 19]. Observe that, by construction, H is an induced subgraph of G , i.e., $H = G[V(H)]$. Let ℓ'_H be the restriction of ℓ_G to the vertices of H . Recall that, each edge (u, v) of H appears in G as the intra-pole edge of the graph $W_s(u, v)$. By [Claim 22](#), we have that $\ell_G(u, v) = s$ for any edge (u, v) of H . Therefore, the drawing Γ'_H of H contained in Γ_G is a level planar drawing of (H, ℓ'_H) , in which each edge has span exactly s . It follows immediately that the leveling ℓ_H of H such that $\ell_H(v) = \frac{\ell'_H(v)}{s}$ is such that ℓ_H is proper and (H, ℓ_H) is level planar. In fact, a straight-line level planar drawing Γ_H of (H, ℓ_H) can be obtained from Γ'_H by simply placing each vertex v at a point whose x -coordinate is the x -coordinate of v in Γ'_H and whose y -coordinate is the y -coordinate of v in Γ'_H divided by s . ◀

B Omitted Material from Section 4

Throughout the section, we are going to use the following combinatorial observation.

► **Lemma 23.** *Let $X \subseteq V$ be a set of vertices in a planar graph $G = (V, E)$. The number of vertices in $V \setminus X$ that are connected to at least three vertices in X is at most $2|X|$. Further, the number of pairs (x, y) of vertices in X such that x and y are the neighbors of a degree-2 vertex in $V - X$ is at most $3|X|$.*

Proof. From [12, Lemma 13.3], we have that the number of vertices in $V \setminus X$ that are connected to at least three vertices in X is at most $\max\{2|X| - 4, 0\} \leq 2|X|$. We prove the second statement. Consider the subgraph H of G induced by the vertices in X and by the degree-2 vertices in $V - X$ that are neighbors of two vertices in X . For each pair (x, y) of vertices in X such that x and y are the neighbors of a degree-2 vertex v_{xy} in $V - X$, replace in H the path (x, v_{xy}, y) with an edge (x, y) and remove the vertex v_{xy} . Further modify H by replacing multiple edges connecting two vertices (x, y) with a single edge (x, y) . Now H is a planar graph with X as vertex set and with an edge between two vertices if, in G , they are the neighbors of a degree-2 vertex in $V - X$. The second statement follows. ◀

B.1 Parameterization by Vertex Cover

In this section, we show that s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY has a kernel whose size is polynomial in the size of a vertex cover. Hence, the problem is FPT with respect to this size. Consider an instance (G, s) of s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY, where $G = (V, E)$ is a planar graph and $s \geq 1$ is an integer; recall that the problem asks whether G admits a weakly leveled planar drawing whose span is at most s . Let C be a vertex cover, i.e., a set of vertices such that every edge has at least one end-vertex in C and let $k := |C|$. We start by showing that, if s is sufficiently large (namely, larger than $6k$), then (G, s) is a positive instance, hence we can assume that s is bounded w.r.t. k .

In order to do that, we construct a *trimmed graph* $\text{trim}(G)$, by removing all the degree-1 vertices of G in $V \setminus C$ and “smoothing” all degree-2 vertices of G in $V \setminus C$ (that is, removing each degree-2 vertex and connecting its neighbors with an edge). Note that $\text{trim}(G)$ has at most $3k$ vertices. Indeed, by [Lemma 23](#), we have that G (and hence $\text{trim}(G)$) has at

most $2k$ vertices in $V \setminus C$ whose degree is at least three. Further, by construction, $\text{trim}(G)$ has no degree-1 and degree-2 vertex in $V \setminus C$. Finally, $\text{trim}(G)$ has at most k vertices in C . An arbitrary levelled planar drawing Γ_t of $\text{trim}(G)$ without empty levels has height, and hence span, at most $3k$. A levelled planar drawing Γ_G of G can then be constructed from Γ_t by inserting a new level between any two consecutive levels of Γ_t . This at most doubles the span of the edges which is now at most $6k$. The new levels can be used for reinserting the removed degree-1 vertices of G (on a level next to the one of their neighbor) and the smoothed degree-2 vertices (at the intersection between the edge they have to lie on and the new level cutting that edge).

We now proceed by showing how to obtain a kernel for the given instance (G, s) of s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELLED PLANARITY. This is done by applying the following two reduction rules.

► **Rule 3.** For every vertex $c \in C$, let V_c be the set of degree-1 neighbors of c in $V \setminus C$. If $|V_c| > 3$, remove $|V_c| - 3$ vertices in V_c from G , as well as their incident edges.

► **Rule 4.** For every pair of vertices $\{c, d\} \in C$, let V_{cd} be the set of degree-2 vertices in $V \setminus C$ with neighborhood $\{c, d\}$. If $|V_{cd}| > 4s + 5$, remove $|V_{cd}| - 4s - 5$ vertices in V_{cd} from G , as well as their incident edges.

► **Lemma 24.** The instance obtained by applying Rules 3 and 4 is equivalent to (G, s) .

Proof. For Rule 3, consider each vertex $c \in C$ such that $|V_c| > 3$. In any weakly levelled planar drawing with span s of the reduced graph, a degree-1 neighbor v_c of c lies on a level different from the one of c , as at most two neighbors of c lie on the same level as c , one to its left and one to its right. All the removed degree-1 neighbors of c can then be placed next to v_c , obtaining a weakly levelled planar drawing of G with span s .

For Rule 4, consider each pair of vertices $\{c, d\} \in C$ such that $|V_{cd}| > 4s + 5$. We first prove that, in any weakly levelled planar drawing with span s of the reduced graph, a degree-2 neighbor of c and d lies on a level strictly between the level $\ell(c)$ of c and the level $\ell(d)$ of d . Note that, since the drawing is weakly levelled planar, each level not lower than $\ell(c)$ and not lower than $\ell(d)$ contains at most two vertices in V_{cd} ; furthermore, there are at most $s + 1$ such levels that are at distance at most s from both $\ell(c)$ and $\ell(d)$. Hence, the number of degree-2 neighbors of c and d that lie on a level not lower than $\ell(c)$ and not lower than $\ell(d)$ is at most $2s + 2$. Likewise, the number of degree-2 neighbors of c and d that lie on a level not higher than $\ell(c)$ and not higher than $\ell(d)$ is at most $2s + 2$. Since the number of degree-2 neighbors of c and d in the reduced graph is $4s + 5$, a degree-2 neighbor v_{cd} of c and d lies on a level strictly between $\ell(c)$ and $\ell(d)$. All the removed degree-2 neighbors of c and d can then be placed next to v_{cd} , obtaining a weakly levelled planar drawing of G with span s . ◀

We now prove the existence of a kernel whose size is a polynomial function of k and s .

► **Theorem 25.** Let (G, s) be an instance of the s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELLED PLANARITY problem with a vertex cover C of size k . Then there exists a kernelization that applied to (G, s) constructs a kernel of size $O(k \cdot s)$. Then (G, s) admits a kernel of size $O(k \cdot s)$.

Proof. Let (G', s) with $G' = (V' \subseteq V, E' \subseteq E)$ be the instance obtained by applying Rules 3 and 4. By Lemma 24, we have that (G, s) and (G', s) are equivalent. To bound the size of G' , we count the number of vertices in $V' \setminus C$. By Lemma 23, the number of vertices with degree at least three is in $O(k)$. The use of Rule 3 and Rule 4 allows us to bound the number of degree-1 vertices in $V' \setminus C$ to $O(k)$, namely 3 for each vertex in C , and the number of degree-2 vertices in $V' \setminus C$ to $O(k \cdot s)$, namely $4s + 5$ for each pair of vertices in C that are connected to a degree-2 vertex in $V' \setminus C$; the number of such pairs is in $O(k)$ by Lemma 23. Finally, the number of vertices in C is in $O(k)$. ◀

Finally, we get rid of the dependence on s of the kernel size.

► **Theorem 6.** *Let (G, s) be an instance of s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY with a vertex cover C of size k . There exists a kernelization that applied to (G, s) constructs a kernel of size $O(k^2)$. Hence, the problem is FPT with respect to the size of a vertex cover.*

Proof. The kernel (G', s) is obtained as in Theorem 25, by applying Rules 3 and 4, however, for each pair of vertices $\{c, d\} \in C$, the number of degree-2 vertices of G that are neighbors of c and d and that are kept in the kernel is at most $24k + 5$. Since this number is in $O(k)$ and since the number of pairs of vertices $\{c, d\} \in C$ such that c and d are the neighbors of a degree-2 vertex in $V - C$ is also in $O(k)$ by Lemma 23, the bound on the kernel size follows from the one of Theorem 25. Since the kernel can be constructed in polynomial time, it follows that s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY is FPT with respect to k .

It remains to prove that (G', s) is equivalent to (G, s) . The proof distinguishes two cases. If $s \leq 6k$, then the proof follows from Theorem 25, as in this case (G', s) is the same kernel as the one computed for that theorem. On the other hand, if $s > 6k$, as proved previously (G, s) is a positive instance, and hence (G', s) is a positive instance, as well. ◀

B.2 Modulator to Bounded Size Components

In this section, we extend the results of Appendix B.1 by providing a parameterization for s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY that is stronger than the one by vertex cover. This comes at the expense of an increase in the size of the kernel (namely, this size is now going to be exponential) with respect to the one of Theorem 6.

For a component C of $G - M$, its *attachments*, denoted by $\text{att}(C)$, are the vertices of M adjacent to vertices of C . For a component C , we denote by $\text{bridge}(C)$ the subgraph of G formed by $C \cup \text{att}(C)$ together with all edges between vertices of C and vertices of $\text{att}(C)$.

As for vertex cover, the first ingredient consists of showing that, if the span is sufficiently large (namely, larger than $(5b + 1)bk$), then (G, s) is a positive instance, hence we can assume that s is bounded w.r.t. $b + k$.

We start with three lemmata about the drawings of the connected components of $G - M$.

► **Lemma 26.** *Suppose that G is connected. Let $\{u, v\} \subseteq M$ be such that there are two distinct connected components C, C' of $G - M$ with $\text{att}(C) = \text{att}(C') = \{u, v\}$. Then in every planar drawing of G we have that u and v are incident to a common face.*

Proof. Assume, for a contradiction, that there is a planar drawing Γ of G in which u and v are not incident to a common face. Then there exists a cycle \mathcal{O} in G that has u inside and v outside in Γ , w.l.o.g. up to renaming u with v . If \mathcal{O} belongs to $G - C$, then C crosses \mathcal{O} in Γ , a contradiction. If \mathcal{O} belongs to C , then C' crosses C in Γ , also a contradiction. ◀

► **Lemma 27.** *Let X be an n_x -vertex planar graph and x be a vertex of X . Then X has a leveled planar drawing on n_x levels where x is the unique vertex on the lowest (or highest, as desired) level.*

Proof. We show how to construct the required drawing with x on the lowest level, the other case is symmetric. Augment X with extra edges so that it becomes a biconnected planar graph X' . Compute then an *st-numbering* [18] of X' with $s := x$; this is a bijective mapping from $V(X')$ to the set $\{1, \dots, n_x\}$ such that a special vertex s (for us, this is x) gets number 1, a special vertex t (for us, this is any vertex sharing a face with x in a planar embedding of X') gets number n_x , and every other vertex has both a neighbor with lower number and a

neighbor with higher number. Then X' admits a leveled planar drawing such that the vertex with number i lies on level i [6, Theorem 3.5]. Restricting such a drawing to the edges of X provides the desired drawing. ◀

► **Lemma 28.** *Let X be an n_x -vertex planar graph, and let x and y be two vertices of X such that X admits a planar drawing in which x and y are incident to a common face. Then X admits a leveled planar drawing on n_x levels where x is the unique vertex on the lowest (or highest, as desired) level and y is the unique vertex on the highest (resp. lowest) level.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of Lemma 27. We again only show the construction to make x the lowest vertex. If the edge (x, y) is not in X , then add it to X . Because of the assumption that X admits a planar drawing in which x and y are incident to a common face, this preserves the planarity of X . Further augment X with extra edges so that it becomes a biconnected planar graph X' . Compute then an st -numbering of X' with $s := x$ and $t := y$. Then X' admits a leveled planar drawing in which the vertex with number i lies on level i [6, Theorem 3.5]. Restricting such a drawing to the edges of X provides the desired drawing. ◀

We now proceed to construct a *trimmed graph* $\text{trim}(G)$. This is done by removing all components C of $G - M$ with $|\text{att}(C)| = 1$. Further, for each pair $\{u, v\} \subseteq M$ such that there are at least two components C, C' with $\text{att}(C') = \text{att}(C) = \{u, v\}$, we remove all such components and replace them by a single edge uv . We have the following.

► **Lemma 29.** *We have that $\text{trim}(G)$ is planar and has size at most $(5b + 1)k$.*

Proof. We first prove the planarity of $\text{trim}(G)$. Actually, this follows from the planarity of G almost directly, with one caveat. For each pair $\{u, v\} \subseteq M$ such that there are at least two components C, C' with $\text{att}(C') = \text{att}(C) = \{u, v\}$, Lemma 26 ensures that the insertion of the edge (u, v) preserves the planarity of $\text{trim}(G)$. Note that if a pair $\{u, v\} \subseteq M$ is such that there is a unique component C with $\text{att}(C) = \{u, v\}$, then a statement analogous to the one of Lemma 26 does not hold, and that is why we cannot replace C with the edge (u, v) .

We now prove the bound on the size of $\text{trim}(G)$. By Lemma 23, we have that $\text{trim}(G)$ contains at most $2k$ components with three or more attachments, with b vertices each, for a total of at most $2bk$ vertices. Also by Lemma 23, we have that $\text{trim}(G)$ contains at most $3k$ pairs $\{u, v\} \subseteq M$ of vertices such that there exists a component C with $\text{att}(C) = \{u, v\}$ and, by construction, for each such a pair $\{u, v\}$, there is at most one component C with $\text{att}(C) = \{u, v\}$. This results in $3bk$ additional vertices in such components. Finally, $\text{trim}(G)$ has at most k vertices in M . We are now ready to prove the following. ◀

► **Lemma 30.** *Suppose that $s > (5b + 1)bk$. Then (G, s) is a positive instance of s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY.*

Proof. Let Γ_t be an arbitrary leveled planar drawing of $\text{trim}(G)$ without empty levels. Since the size of $\text{trim}(G)$ is bounded by $(5b + 1)k$, it follows that the height and therefore also the span of Γ is at most $(5b + 1)k$. To obtain a leveled planar drawing Γ_G of G , we insert b intermediate levels between any pair of consecutive levels of Γ_t , resulting in a total of $(5b + 1)bk$ levels. We use these levels to re-insert the components of G that we removed to obtain $\text{trim}(G)$. This is done as follows. For each component C of $G - M$ with a single attachment u , by Lemma 27 we obtain a drawing of $\text{bridge}(C)$ on $b + 1$ levels in which u is the unique vertex on the highest level. We can thus use the level of u and the b intermediate levels below it to merge such a drawing into Γ_G (by identifying the two copies of u). Similarly,

for a component C of $G - M$ with $\text{att}(C) = \{u, v\}$, if C is not contained in $\text{trim}(G)$, then $\text{trim}(G)$ contains the edge (u, v) . By Lemma 28, $\text{bridge}(C)$ has a drawing on $b + 2$ levels, where u and v are on the highest and lowest level, respectively. As u and v are drawn on distinct levels in Γ_t , there are b intermediate levels between them in Γ_G , and we can merge the drawing of $\text{bridge}(C)$ next to e (by merging the two copies of u and the two copies of v , respectively). Since these are the only components of $G - M$ that are not contained in $\text{trim}(G)$, this yields a drawing Γ_G of G on $(5b + 1)bk$ levels. Therefore (G, s) is a positive instance of s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY. \blacktriangleleft

We now proceed to show how to obtain a kernel for the given instance (G, s) of s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY. We define two components of $G - M$ with $|\text{att}(C)| \leq 2$ as *equivalent* if $\text{att}(C) = \text{att}(C')$ and moreover $\text{bridge}(C)$ and $\text{bridge}(C')$ are isomorphic with an isomorphism that keeps the attachments fixed. The following lemma follows from the fact that the number of planar graphs on b vertices is an exponential function of b .

► **Lemma 31.** *There is a computable function $f: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for any planar graph G and any b -modulator of size k , there are at most $f(b)$ equivalence classes of components of $G - M$ with two specified attachments.*

In order to prove the correctness of the upcoming kernelization, we are going to need to two topological lemmata about leveled planar drawings.

► **Lemma 32.** *Let (G, ℓ) be a leveled planar graph with a leveled planar drawing Γ and let v be a cutvertex of G that is part of $4t$ blocks. Then at least one of the following two statements is true in Γ :*


- *A block incident to v is entirely above or entirely below v , except at v itself.*
- *A block incident to v has height larger than or equal to t .*

Proof. Assume that there is no block incident to v whose vertices different from v all lie above or all lie below v . Then each block intersects the level $\ell(v)$ at a point different from v , where an intersection is either a crossing between the level and an edge of the block or is a vertex of the block that is different from v and that lies on $\ell(v)$. For each block C_i , let π_i be a curve that is part of the drawing of C_i in Γ , that connects v with a point p_i different from v on $\ell(v)$, and that does not contain any point on $\ell(v)$ in its interior. Assume that at least $2t$ of the points p_i are to the right of v , as the case in which $2t$ of the points p_i are to the left of v is symmetric. Let C_1, \dots, C_{2t} be $2t$ blocks such that the points p_1, \dots, p_{2t} are to the right of v , where p_1, \dots, p_{2t} are in this left-to-right order along $\ell(v)$. For $i = 1, \dots, 2t$, since p_{i+1} lies right of p_i and the curves π_1, \dots, π_{2t} are pairwise non-crossing, it follows that π_{i+1} intersects a level that is strictly above or strictly below all levels that are intersected by π_1, \dots, π_i . Therefore one of the blocks contains a vertex that is either t levels below or t levels above v , i.e., its height is at least t . \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 33.** *Let (G, ℓ) be a leveled planar graph with a leveled planar drawing Γ and let $\{u, v\}$ be a separating pair G with $\ell(u) \leq \ell(v)$ that is part of $8t$ split components. Then at least one of the following statements is true in Γ :*

- *A split component incident to u and v is strictly between $\ell(u)$ and $\ell(v)$, except at u and v .*
- *A split component incident to u and v has height larger than or equal to t .*

Proof. Assume that there is no split component whose vertices different from u and v all lie strictly between $\ell(u)$ and $\ell(v)$. Then each split component intersects the level $\ell(u)$ at a



■ **Figure 12** (a) The component C' (shaded gray) in Γ' . Other than C' , only the boundary of the face f is shown. (b) Using a straight-line drawing algorithm [2, 10, 19] to draw the graph together with a new copy of C' .

point different from u or intersects the level $\ell(v)$ at a point different from v . Assume that there are at least $4t$ split components that intersect $\ell(v)$ at a point different from v , as the other case is symmetric. The rest of the proof is the same as in [Lemma 32](#). For each split component C_i that intersect $\ell(v)$ at a point different from v , let π_i be a curve that is part of the drawing of C_i in Γ , that connects v with a point p_i different from v on $\ell(v)$, and that does not contain any point on $\ell(v)$ in its interior. Assume that at least $2t$ of the points p_i are to the right of v , as the other case is symmetric. Let C_1, \dots, C_{2t} be $2t$ split components such that the points p_1, \dots, p_{2t} are to the right of v , where p_1, \dots, p_{2t} are in this left-to-right order along $\ell(v)$. For $i = 1, \dots, 2t - 1$, since p_{i+1} lies right of p_i and the curves π_1, \dots, π_{2t} are pairwise non-crossing, it follows that π_{i+1} intersects a level that is strictly above or strictly below all levels that are intersected by π_1, \dots, π_i . Therefore one of the split components contains a vertex that is either t levels below or t levels above v , i.e., its height is at least t . ◀

We are now ready to show the two reduction rules that allow us to get a kernel from the given instance (G, s) with a b -modulator M of size k .

► **Lemma 34.** *The instance obtained by applying [Rules 1](#) and [2](#) is equivalent to (G, s) .*

Proof. Let G' be the instance obtained by applying [Rules 1](#) and [2](#) to G . Clearly, if (G, s) is a positive instance of s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY, then (G', s) is a positive instance too, as G' is a subgraph of G . In order to show that, if (G', s) is a positive instance, then (G, s) is a positive instance too, we need to prove that the components removed by applying [Rules 1](#) and [2](#) can be inserted in a weakly leveled planar drawing Γ' of G' with $\text{span}(\Gamma') \leq s$ so that in the resulting drawing Γ the span remains bounded by s . We reinsert one component C at a time; we always call Γ' the drawing into which we are inserting C , although several components previously removed by [Rules 1](#) and [2](#) might have been reinserted already. We distinguish two cases based on whether $|\text{att}(C)| = 1$ or $|\text{att}(C)| = 2$.

We start with the case $|\text{att}(C)| = 1$. Let $\text{att}(C) = \{v\}$. As C was removed by [Rule 1](#), we have that $G' - M$ contains $(4s + 4)b$ components equivalent to C . If one of them, say C' , is such that $\text{bridge}(C')$ were drawn with height at least $(s + 1)b$, then $\text{bridge}(C')$ would contain an edge whose span is at least $s + 1$, given that $\text{bridge}(C')$ is connected and has at most $b + 1$ vertices. However, this would contradict $\text{span}(\Gamma') \leq s$. It hence follows from [Lemma 32](#), applied with $t = (s + 1)b$, that $G' - M$ contains a component C' equivalent to C that is entirely drawn above (or below) v in Γ' ; assume the former, as the latter case is symmetric.

Consider the leftmost vertex u of C' on the highest level intersected by C' and let f be the face of Γ' that is immediately to the left of u ; see [Fig. 12a](#). We insert another copy of C' in f , with the two copies identified at v . It might be the case that new copy of C' cannot

be drawn monotonically inside f in Γ' , however, since all the vertices in the path that is encountered when walking in clockwise direction along the outer face of C' from u to v lie on levels strictly between those of u and v , the insertion of new copy of C' maintains the graph leveled planar. Then the graph, together with the new copy of C' , can be planarly redrawn so that each vertex remains on the same level and each edge is a straight-line segment [2, 10, 19], thus weakly y -monotone; see Fig. 12b. Since C is equivalent to C' , we can interpret the new copy of C' as a drawing of C . This completes the reinsertion of C in Γ' .

The case $|\text{att}(C)| = 2$ works similarly. Let $\text{att}(C) = \{u, v\}$. W.l.o.g., assume $\ell(u) \leq \ell(v)$. As C was removed by Rule 2, we have that $G' - M$ contains $(8s + 8)(b + 1)$ components equivalent to C . If one of such components, say C' , is such that $\text{bridge}(C')$ were drawn with height at least $(s + 1)(b + 1)$ then, since $\text{bridge}(C')$ is connected and has at most $b + 2$ vertices, $\text{bridge}(C')$ would contain an edge whose span is at least $s + 1$, contradicting $\text{span}(\Gamma') \leq s$. It hence follows from Lemma 33, applied with $t = (s + 1)(b + 1)$, that $G' - M$ contains a component C' equivalent to C that is drawn strictly between $\ell(u)$ and $\ell(v)$ in Γ' . Again, we can insert a new copy of C' immediately to the left of C' , where the two copies are identified at u and v , and redraw the entire graph with straight-line segments. By interpreting the new copy of C' as C , we obtain a drawing of $G' \cup C$ with span at most s . ◀

We are now ready to prove the following.

► **Theorem 35.** *Let (G, s) be an instance of the s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY problem and a b -modulator of size k . Then there exists a kernelization that applied to (G, s) constructs a kernel of size $O(f(b) \cdot k \cdot b^2 \cdot s)$.*

Proof. First, we prove that testing whether two components C, C' of $G - M$ with $\text{att}(C) = \text{att}(C')$ and $|\text{att}(C)| \leq 2$ are equivalent can be done in polynomial time. This is done as follows. Recall that each of C and C' has at most b vertices. Assume that $|\text{att}(C)| = 2$, as the case $|\text{att}(C)| = 1$ is easier to discuss. Let $\text{att}(C) = \text{att}(C') = \{u, v\}$. Augment each of C and C' with a path of length $b + 1$ attached to u and with a path of length $b + 2$ attached to v . Let C_+ and C'_+ be the resulting graphs, respectively. Now any isomorphism between C_+ and C'_+ is an isomorphism between C and C' that maps to one another the two copies of u and maps to one another the two copies of v . Thus, testing the equivalence of C and C' amounts to testing the isomorphism of C_+ and C'_+ , which can be done in $O(b)$ time [16].

Since there are $O(n)$ components in $G - M$ that have to be pairwise tested for equivalence, it follows that the kernelization of Rules 1 and 2 can be performed in polynomial time, resulting in an instance (G', s) which, by Lemma 34, is equivalent to (G, s) .

It remains to bound the size of G' . By Lemma 23, there are at most $2k$ components of $G' - M$ with three or more attachments, which together contribute with $O(k \cdot b)$ vertices to the size of G' . Further, the number of vertices in M is in $O(k)$. We thus only need to bound the number of vertices in the components of $G' - M$ that have one or two attachments.

For a fixed vertex $u \in M$, there are at most $f(b)$ equivalence classes of components of $G' - M$ with sole attachment u . Due to Rule 1, each such equivalence class contains $O(b \cdot s)$ components. Since each component has at most b vertices, the components whose attachment is a fixed vertex $u \in M$ contribute with at most $O(f(b) \cdot b^2 \cdot s)$ vertices to G' , and thus all components with a single attachment contribute with $O(f(b) \cdot k \cdot b^2 \cdot s)$ vertices in total.

Similarly, for a fixed pair of vertices $\{u, v\} \in M$, there are at most $f(b)$ equivalence classes of components of $G' - M$ with attachments $\{u, v\}$. Due to Rule 2, each such equivalence class contains $O(b \cdot s)$ components. Since each component has at most b vertices, the components whose attachments are a fixed pair of vertices $\{u, v\} \in M$ contribute with at

most $O(f(b) \cdot b^2 \cdot s)$ vertices to G' , and thus all components with two attachments contribute with $O(f(b) \cdot k \cdot b^2 \cdot s)$ vertices in total, as there are $O(k)$ such components, by [Lemma 23](#). ◀

By [Lemma 30](#), we obtain the following.

► **Theorem 7.** *Let (G, s) be an instance of s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY with a b -modulator of size k . There exists a kernelization that applied to (G, s) constructs a kernel of size $O(f(b) \cdot k^2 \cdot b^4)$. Hence, the problem is FPT with respect to $k + b$.*

Proof. The kernel (G', s) is obtained as in [Theorem 35](#), by applying [Rules 1](#) and [2](#), however:

- for each vertex $u \in M$, the number of components with attachment $\{u\}$ that belong to each equivalence class and that are kept in the kernel is at most $(4((5b + 1) \cdot b \cdot k) + 4) \cdot b$; and
- for each pair of vertices $\{u, v\} \in M$, the number of components with attachments $\{u, v\}$ that belong to each equivalence class and that are kept in the kernel is at most $(8((5b + 1) \cdot b \cdot k) + 8) \cdot (b + 1)$.

Since the number of equivalence classes is at most $f(b)$, the number of vertices in each component is at most b , and the number of pairs of vertices $\{u, v\} \in M$ that are attachment to some component of $G - M$ is in $O(k)$ by [Lemma 23](#), it follows that the size of the kernel is $O(f(b) \cdot k^2 \cdot b^4)$. Since the kernel can be constructed in polynomial time, as proved in [Theorem 35](#), it follows that s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY is FPT with respect to k .

It remains to prove that (G', s) is equivalent to (G, s) . The proof distinguishes two cases. If $s \leq (5b + 1) \cdot b \cdot k$, then the proof follows from [Theorem 25](#), as in this case (G', s) is the same kernel as the one computed for that theorem. On the other hand, if $s > (5b + 1) \cdot b \cdot k$, by [Lemma 30](#), we have that (G, s) is a positive instance, and hence (G', s) is a positive instance, as well. ◀

B.3 Treedepth

► **Theorem 8.** *Every planar graph with treedepth td has a leveled planar drawing of height at most $((5td)^{td} + 1)^{td}$.*

Proof. We first defined a trimmed graph from G (and a corresponding treedepth decomposition from T). The trimming operation we define in order to get the trimmed graph is similar to the one defined in [Appendix B.2](#). However, it is applied $td + 1$ times, namely for increasing values of i from 1 to td , it is applied to all the vertices of G that have depth i in T . The main feature of the trimming operation is that, for each processed vertex v of G , the outdegree (that is, the number of children) of v in T is bounded by $5td$.

Vertices at depth 0 already satisfy this property initially. Let v be a non-processed vertex at depth j whose children u_1, \dots, u_k have been already processed. We process v as follows. By the defining property of a treedepth decomposition, each connected component of $G - R(v)$ is such that its vertex set is either part of V_{u_i} , for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, or is disjoint from V_{u_i} . Let \mathcal{C} denote the set of connected components of $G - R(v)$ whose vertex sets are contained in the sets V_{u_1}, \dots, V_{u_k} . We remove all components in \mathcal{C} with one attachment and, if there are two or more distinct components in \mathcal{C} with the same two attachments $\{s, t\}$, we replace all such components with a single edge (s, t) . By [Lemma 23](#), there are at most $3td$ pairs $\{s, t\}$ such that \mathcal{C} contains a component whose attachment is $\{s, t\}$. Furthermore, again by [Lemma 23](#), there are at most $2td$ components in \mathcal{C} with three or more attachments in $R(v)$. Henceforth, the number of components in \mathcal{C} that survive the trimming operation is at most $5td$. This is also an upper bound on the size of the outdegree of v in T .

Let $(G_0, T_0) := (G, T)$. For $j = 1, \dots, td$, we define (G_j, T_j) to be the graph obtained from (G_{j-1}, T_{j-1}) by processing all vertices at depth j as described above. We claim that in (G_j, T_j) all vertices at depth j or less have outdegree at most $5td$ in T_j . This clearly holds for (G_0, T_0) , since leaves have outdegree 0. Furthermore, the described processing of vertices at depth j ensures that the claim holds for (G_j, T_j) given that it holds for (G_{j-1}, T_{j-1}) .

Note that, by construction, the graph G_{td} consists of a single vertex, given that $R(r)$ consists just of the root r and no component of $G - R(r)$ with one attachment is kept in G_{td} by the trimming operation. Therefore, G_{td} has a leveled planar drawing with height 1. Similarly to Lemma 30, we show that, given a leveled planar drawing of G_i with height h , we can construct a leveled planar drawing of G_{i-1} of height $h((5td)^{td} + 1)$. This then implies a drawing of $G = G_0$ of height $((5td)^{td} + 1)^{td}$, as desired.

Let Γ_i be a leveled planar drawing of G_i with height h . To obtain a leveled planar drawing Γ_{i-1} of G_{i-1} , we insert $(5td)^{td}$ levels immediately below every level of Γ_i (thus, the number of levels of Γ_{i-1} is $h((5td)^{td} + 1)$). We use these levels to re-insert the components of G_{i-1} that were removed to obtain G_i . This is done as follows. Let C be one of such components and let v be the vertex whose processing (in T_{i-1}) led to the removal of C . By assumption, all vertices in $V_v \setminus \{v\}$ have outdegree at most $5td$ in T_{i-1} and therefore the number of vertices in C is at most $(5td)^{td}$. If C has a single attachment $x \in R(v)$, by Lemma 27, we obtain a leveled planar drawing Γ_C of C together with its attachment on $(5td)^{td} + 1$ levels in which x is the unique vertex on the highest level. Note that x belongs to Γ_i . We can thus use the level of x and the $(5td)^{td}$ new levels immediately below it to merge Γ_C into Γ_i (by merging the two copies of x). If C has two attachments $x, y \in R(v)$, then G_i contains the edge (x, y) . By Lemma 28, we have that C together with x, y have a leveled planar drawing Γ_C on $(5td)^{td} + 2$ levels, where x and y are the unique vertices on the highest and the lowest level, respectively. Note that x and y belong to Γ_i . As x and y are drawn on distinct levels in Γ_i , there are $(5td)^{td}$ new intermediate levels between them, and we can merge the drawing of $C \cup \{x, y\}$ into Γ_i next to (x, y) (by merging the two copies of x and the two copies of y , respectively). By reinserting all components in this way, we obtain a leveled planar drawing Γ_{i-1} of G_{i-1} with height $h((5td)^{td} + 1)$. ◀

We now proceed to devise our kernelization for an instance (G, s) of s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY parameterized by the treedepth of G . As a first step, the algorithm checks whether $s > ((5td)^{td} + 1)^{td}$. In the positive case, the kernel consists of any graph that admits a leveled planar drawing with span at most s (say, the graph consists of a single vertex). Indeed, a leveled planar drawing of G with height, and hence span, at most $((5td)^{td} + 1)^{td} < s$ can be constructed as in Theorem 8, hence the instance is positive (and the kernel is a positive instance, too). In the following, we hence assume that $s \leq ((5td)^{td} + 1)^{td}$.

Recall that $f(b)$ denotes the number of equivalence classes of planar graphs with $b + 1$ vertices, one of which is fixed, or with $b + 2$ vertices, two of which are fixed (see Appendix B.2). We also define a computable function $g: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ via the following recurrence:

$$g(i, s) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = 1 \\ (12s + 12) \cdot (g(i - 1, s) + 1) \cdot 3td \cdot f(g(i - 1, s)) + 2td + 1 & \text{if } i \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

Our goal is to process T in a bottom-up fashion so that, at any point of the traversal, the graph G and the tree T have been modified so that the following invariants are satisfied:

- (I1) the current instance (G, s) is equivalent to the original instance (G, s) ;
- (I2) T is still a treedepth decomposition of G ; and
- (I3) for each processed vertex v , we have $|V_v| \leq g(d(v), s)$.

The bottom line is that, when the entire tree has been processed, the above invariants guarantee that we have an instance equivalent to the original one of size at most $g(td, s)$. Since s is bounded by a function of td , this is indeed a kernel.

For a leaf v of T , we do not need to perform any action. This ensures that invariants (I1) and (I2) are trivially satisfied after all the leaves of T have been processed. Note that the size of T_v is 1, which coincides with $g(d(v), s)$, given that $d(v) = 1$ and by the definition of the function g . Hence, invariant (I3) is also satisfied.

Consider now an unprocessed vertex v of T with children u_1, \dots, u_k that have been already processed. The key intuition that we are going to use is that $R(v)$ is a modulator of size at most td to components of size at most $g(d(v) - 1, s)$ for the subgraph G' of G induced by the vertices in $V_v \cup R(v)$. Hence, we can apply the machinery introduced in [Appendix B.2](#) in order to reduce the size of G' (and, consequently, of T_v). We now justify and describe in detail this strategy.

First, by induction, we have that T_{u_i} has size at most $g(d(v) - 1, s)$, for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Also, the set $R(v)$ has size at most td , as the depth of T is td . By the defining property of a treedepth decomposition, each connected component of $G - R(v)$ is such that its vertex set is either part of V_{u_i} , for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, or is disjoint from V_v . Let \mathcal{C} denote the set of connected components of $G - R(v)$ whose vertex sets are contained in the sets V_{u_1}, \dots, V_{u_k} . By invariant (I3), each component in \mathcal{C} has size at most $g(d(v) - 1, s)$. By [Lemma 23](#), there are at most $2td$ such components that have three or more attachments in $R(v)$. We reduce the number of components in \mathcal{C} with one and two attachments in $R(v)$, by applying [Rules 1](#) and [2](#). By [Lemma 23](#), there are at most $3td$ pairs $\{x, y\}$ of vertices in $R(v)$ such that \mathcal{C} contains a component whose attachments are x and y . By [Lemma 31](#), there are at most $f(g(d(v) - 1, s))$ equivalence classes for the components in \mathcal{C} that have at most two attachments in $R(v)$ and for which these attachments are fixed. Hence, the number of components in \mathcal{C} with one and two attachments in $R(v)$ that are kept in G is at most $(4s + 4) \cdot g(d(v) - 1, s) \cdot td \cdot f(g(d(v) - 1, s))$ and $(8s + 8) \cdot (g(d(v) - 1, s) + 1) \cdot 3td \cdot f(g(d(v) - 1, s))$, respectively.

- By [Lemma 34](#), the described reduction yields an equivalent instance², hence satisfying Invariant (I1).
- The new treedepth decomposition T of the reduced graph G is simply obtained from the previous one by removing all vertices belonging to components in \mathcal{C} that have been removed from G , and by then connecting each vertex in T_v whose parent has been removed from T to the lowest ancestor (in the previous tree) which still belongs to T . Since a pair of vertices are in an ancestor-descendant relationship in the new tree if and only if they were in the previous tree, it follows that T is still a treedepth decomposition of the reduced graph G , thus satisfying Invariant (I2).
- Finally, after the reduction, the size of T_v is at most $2td$ (for the components in \mathcal{C} with three attachments in $R(v)$) plus $(12s + 12) \cdot (g(d(v) - 1, s) + 1) \cdot 3td \cdot f(g(d(v) - 1, s))$ (for the components in \mathcal{C} with one or two attachments in $R(v)$) plus one (for v itself). This coincides with $g(d(v), s)$, hence satisfying Invariant (I3).

Altogether we obtain the following theorem.

²The correctness of the reduction actually does not directly descend from [Lemma 34](#), as in that case [Rules 1](#) and [2](#) apply to all the components obtained by removing the modulator from the graph. In our case, [Rules 1](#) and [2](#) only apply to the components in \mathcal{C} , which are just part of the components obtained by removing the modulator $R(v)$ from G . However, the proof of [Lemma 34](#) is not affected by the presence of components that are ignored by [Rules 1](#) and [2](#), hence the very same proof of correctness applies to the current reduction, as well.

► **Theorem 9.** *Let (G, s) be an instance of s -SPAN WEAKLY LEVELED PLANARITY with treedepth td . There exists a kernelization that applied to (G, s) constructs a kernel whose size is a computable function of td . Hence, the problem is FPT with respect to the treedepth.*

C Omitted Material from Section 5

In this section, we provide detailed proofs that were omitted from Section 5 due to space restrictions.

► **Theorem 10.** *There exists an n -vertex 2-outerplanar graph such that every weakly leveled planar drawing of it has span in $\Omega(n)$.*


Proof. Suppose first that n is odd. The lower bound is provided by the graph G_k composed of $k := \lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor$ “1-fused stacked cycles” (see Fig. 3a): Start from k cycles $\mathcal{C}_i := (u_i, v_i, z_i)$, identify vertices z_1, \dots, z_k into a unique vertex z , and insert the edges of the paths (u_1, \dots, u_k) and (v_1, \dots, v_k) . Biedl [1] introduced G_k as an example of a 2-outerplanar graph requiring $\Omega(n)$ width and height in any planar polyline grid drawing. We can use the same inductive proof as hers to show that one of the edges of \mathcal{C}_k has a span $k \in \Omega(n)$ in any weakly leveled planar drawing Γ_k of G_k in which the outer face is delimited by \mathcal{C}_k . If $k = 1$, the claim is trivial. If $k > 1$, consider the subgraph G_{k-1} of G_k induced by $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{k-1}$ and let Γ_{k-1} be the restriction of Γ_k to G_{k-1} . By induction, in Γ_{k-1} one of the edges of \mathcal{C}_{k-1} , say e , has span at least $k-1$. Since \mathcal{C}_k surrounds e in its interior in Γ_k , except possibly the vertex z that might be shared by e and \mathcal{C}_k , it follows that \mathcal{C}_k touches at least one more level than e , hence the longest edge of \mathcal{C}_k has span at least k in Γ_k . Two observations conclude the proof. First, in any weakly leveled planar drawing of G_k , there is a subgraph with at least $\lceil k/2 \rceil \in \Omega(n)$ 1-fused stacked cycles that is drawn so that these cycles are one nested into the other (this removes the assumption that the outer face has to be delimited by \mathcal{C}_k). Second, if n is even, we can add to G_k a vertex adjacent to z and u_1 ; this maintains the graph 2-outerplanar. ◀

C.1 3-connected Cycle-Trees

In order to prove Lemma 37, we will construct a drawing such that the non-horizontal edges connecting vertices on different levels are y -monotone polygonal chains whose consecutive segments meet at a level. We are going to exploit the following.

► **Lemma 36** (Geometric realizability). *Let G be a plane graph and u, v, w be three vertices that are consecutive in clockwise order along the outer face of G . Let ℓ be a single-sink leveling of G with respect to (u, v, w) such that (G, ℓ) admits a weakly leveled planar drawing that respects the embedding of G . Let Γ_0 be any crossing-free y -monotone polyline drawing of the path (u, v, w) such that $y(u) = \ell(u)$, $y(v) = \ell(v)$, $y(w) = \ell(w)$, and $x(u) < x(w)$. Then (G, ℓ) admits a polyline good weakly leveled planar drawing containing Γ_0 .*

Proof. Let Γ be a weakly leveled planar drawing of (G, ℓ) that respects the given embedding of G . Let Γ' be obtained by subdividing each non-horizontal edge of Γ at each level it crosses and replacing the edge segments connecting consecutive vertices by straight-line segments. Note that Γ' is a weakly leveled planar drawing of a graph (G', ℓ') , where G' is a subdivision of G and ℓ' is weakly proper. By Observation 1, it follows that moving the vertices of G' within each level of ℓ' neither changes the embedding of Γ' nor violates its planarity as long as we keep the order of the vertices within each level. Hence, we can move the vertices of G' in such a way that the drawing of the path (u, v, w) is as prescribed by Γ_0 and all other



■ **Figure 13** Illustrations for the proof of Claim 38, when μ is a Q-node and the height of \mathcal{T} is 0.

vertices are in the interior of the region R_{uvw} . The obtained drawing corresponds to a good weakly levelled planar drawing of G containing Γ_0 . ◀

We exploit the Geometric realizability Lemma to prove the following lemma.

► **Lemma 37.** *Almost-3-connected path-trees admit 4-span weakly levelled planar drawings.*

Proof. Consider an almost 3-connected path-tree G and let \mathcal{T} be the SPQ-tree of G with root node μ . Let $u = \lambda_\mu$, $v = \rho_\mu$, and $w = r_\mu$. Since the removal of edges does not increase the span of a weakly levelled planar drawing, this allows us to make a couple of assumptions on G that will simplify the proof. Since, by adding the edges (u, v) and (v, w) to G we obtain an almost 3-connected path-tree, we will assume that these edges are part of G . Also, since G can always be augmented with edges connecting a path vertex and an internal vertex to an internally-triangulated almost 3-connected path-tree having the same outerface as G , we will assume that G is internally triangulated. In other words, in the following, we will prove the statement when G is a maximal almost 3-connected path-tree.

We will prove the statement by showing the following claim based on the type of μ . Indeed, since μ is either an S-, P-, or Q-node, the claim immediately implies the statement of the lemma.

► **Claim 38.** *Let μ be a node of \mathcal{T} . Then, the following holds:*


μ is a P-node. *Then $G = G_\mu$ has levelings ℓ_μ^i for $i = 1, \dots, 4$, with $\text{span}(\ell_\mu^i) \leq 4$, such that (G_μ, ℓ_μ^i) admits a p_i -flat weakly levelled planar drawing with $p_1 = (-1, -1)$, $p_2 = (1, 1)$, $p_3 = (-1, -3)$, and $p_4 = (3, 1)$.*

μ is a Q- or an S-node. *Then G_μ has levelings ℓ_μ^i for $i = 1, \dots, 4$, with $\text{span}(\ell_\mu^i) \leq 4$, such that (G_μ, ℓ_μ^i) admits a q_i -flat weakly levelled planar drawing with $q_1 = (1, 1)$, $q_2 = (-1, -1)$, $q_3 = (3, 1)$, and $q_4 = (-1, -3)$, and levelings ℓ_μ^j for $j = 5, 6$, with $\text{span}(\ell_\mu^j) \leq 4$, such that (G_μ, ℓ_μ^j) admits a q_j -roof weakly levelled planar drawing with $q_5 = (1, -3)$ and $q_6 = (3, -1)$. rising and falling 1, 1-flat, rising 3, 1-flat and falling 1, 3-flat as well as 1, 3-roof and 3, 1-roof weakly levelled planar drawing with span at most 4.*


Proof. We prove Claim 38 by induction on the height of \mathcal{T} .

In the base case, the height of \mathcal{T} is 0, i.e., μ is the unique node of \mathcal{T} . Clearly, μ is a Q-node. It is immediate to see that G_μ admits levelings ℓ_μ^i , for $i = 1, \dots, 4$ and ℓ_μ^j , for $j = 5, 6$, with span at most 4, that establish Claim 38. Fig. 13 shows corresponding examples of weakly levelled planar drawings of (G_μ, ℓ_μ^i) and of (G_μ, ℓ_μ^j) . Note that only the (3, 1)-flat and (-1, 3)-flat weakly levelled planar drawings contain an edge with span 4 (namely, the edge (u, w)).

Now assume that the height of \mathcal{T} is greater than 0, which implies that μ is either a P-node or an S-node. Let ν_1, \dots, ν_k denote the children of μ , with $k \geq 1$ in the left-to-right



(a) (1,1)-flat



(b) (3,1)-flat

■ **Figure 14** Illustrations for the construction of a flat weakly leveled planar drawing of the pertinent graph of a P-node, with odd number (left) and even number (right) of children.


order in which they appear in \mathcal{T} . By inductive hypothesis, we can assume that each G_{ν_i} has levelings admitting weakly leveled planar drawings that satisfy the claim. We distinguish two cases based on the type of μ .

μ is a **P-node**. Since μ is a P-node, each ν_i is an S- or a Q-node ($1 \leq i \leq k$). Note that $u = \lambda_\mu = \lambda_{\nu_1}$, $v = \rho_\mu = \rho_{\nu_1} = \dots = \rho_{\nu_k}$, $w = r_\mu = r_{\nu_k}$ and that $r_{\nu_{i-1}} = \lambda_{\nu_i}$ for $1 < i \leq k$.

We first show how to construct a (1,1)-flat weakly leveled planar drawing of G_μ ; refer to Fig. 14a. To this aim, we draw u at point $(1, -1)$, v at point $(k+1, 0)$, w at point $(2k+3, 1)$, and the edges (u, v) and (v, w) as straight-line segments. For any odd $i \in [k-1]$, we place λ_{ν_i} at coordinate $(i, -1)$ and r_{ν_i} at coordinate $(i+1, -3)$. We draw the edge (v, λ_{ν_i}) as a straight-line segment and the edge (v, r_{ν_i}) with one bend at coordinate $(i+1, -1)$. For any even $i \in [k-1]$, we place λ_{ν_i} at coordinate $(i, -3)$ and r_{ν_i} at coordinate $(i+1, -1)$. We draw the edge (v, λ_{ν_i}) with one bend at coordinate $(i, -1)$ and the edge (v, r_{ν_i}) as a straight-line segment. For $i = k$, note that $\lambda_{\nu_k} = r_{\nu_{k-1}}$ and $r_{\nu_k} = w$ have already been placed.

Note that this defines for every child ν_i a drawing of $(\lambda_{\nu_i}, \rho_{\nu_i}, r_{\nu_i})$, where ρ_{ν_i} coincides with v . By induction, we can assume that (i) for every odd $i \in [k-1]$, G_{ν_i} has a leveling ℓ_i that admits a (1, -3)-roof weakly leveled planar drawing; (ii) for every even $i \in [k-1]$, G_{ν_i} has a leveling ℓ_i that admits a (3, -1)-roof weakly leveled planar drawing; (iii) G_{ν_k} has a leveling that admits a (1,1)-flat weakly leveled planar drawing with span at most 4 and it has a leveling that admits a (3,1)-flat weakly leveled planar drawing with span at most 4.

By construction, for every $i \in [k]$, we have that $y(\lambda_{\nu_i}) = \ell_i(\lambda_{\nu_i})$, $y(\rho_{\nu_i}) = \ell_i(\rho_{\nu_i}) = y(v)$, and $y(r_{\nu_i}) = \ell_i(r_{\nu_i})$. Moreover, again by construction, we have that $x(\lambda_{\nu_i}) < x(r_{\nu_i})$, for every $i \in [k]$. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 36 to obtain a crossing-free y -monotone polyline drawing Γ_{ν_i} of (G_{ν_i}, ℓ_i) inside the region $R_{\lambda_{\nu_i}, \rho_{\nu_i}, r_{\nu_i}}$, for every $i \in [k]$. The union of these drawings is a (1,1)-flat weakly leveled planar drawing of G_μ with span at most 4. Note that the (1,1)-flat weakly leveled planar drawing of G_{ν_k} is used when k is odd and the (3,1)-flat weakly leveled planar drawing is used when k is even.



■ **Figure 15** Illustrations for the construction of a weakly levelled planar drawing of the pertinent graph of an S-node.


The construction of a (3,1)-flat weakly levelled planar drawing of G_μ is similar (refer to Fig. 14b), except that we place u at point $(1, -3)$, draw the edge (u, v) as a 1-bend polyline that starts at u , goes to point $(1, -1)$, and then to v , and we have exchange “odd” and “even” throughout the construction. The constructions of a $(-1, -1)$ -flat and a $(-3, -1)$ -flat weakly levelled planar drawing are symmetric to the constructions of a $(1, 1)$ -flat and a $(3, 1)$ -flat weakly levelled planar drawing, respectively.

μ is an S-node. In this case, $k = 1$ holds, that is, there is a single child $\nu = \nu_1$, which is either an S-, P-, or Q-node. Recall that $u = \lambda_\mu = \lambda_\nu$, $v = \rho_\mu$, $w = r_\mu = r_\nu$; moreover, (ρ_μ, ρ_ν) is an edge of G_μ not in G_ν , and hence $\rho_\mu \neq \rho_\nu$.

We first show how to construct a $(1, 1)$ -flat weakly levelled planar drawing of G_μ (see Fig. 15a); the construction of a $(-1, -1)$ -flat weakly levelled planar drawing of G_μ is symmetric. We draw u at point $(1, -1)$, v at point $(2, 0)$, w at point $(6, 1)$, ρ_ν at point $(3, 0)$, and all edges between u , v , w and ρ_ν as straight-line segments. Since ν is either an S-, P- or Q-node, by induction, we can assume that G_ν has a leveling ℓ_ν such that (G_ν, ℓ_ν) admits a $(1, 1)$ -flat weakly levelled planar drawing with span at most 4. By construction, we have that $y(\lambda_\nu) = \ell_\nu(\lambda_\nu) = y(u)$, $y(\rho_\nu) = \ell_\nu(\rho_\nu)$, and $y(r_\nu) = \ell_\nu(r_\nu) = y(w)$. Moreover, again by construction, we have that $x(\lambda_\nu) < x(r_\nu)$. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 36 to obtain a crossing-free y -monotone polyline drawing Γ_ν of G_ν inside the region $R_{\lambda_\nu, \rho_\nu, r_\nu}$. The union of Γ_ν and the drawing of the subgraph induced by u , $v = \lambda_\nu$, $w = r_\nu$, and ρ_ν described above is a $(1, 1)$ -flat weakly levelled planar drawing of G_μ with span at most 4.

We next show how to construct a $(3, 1)$ -flat weakly levelled planar drawing of G_μ with span at most 4; the construction of a $(-1, -3)$ -flat weakly levelled planar drawing of G_μ with span at most 4 is symmetric. We draw u at point $(1, -3)$, v at point $(2, 0)$, w at point $(6, 1)$, ρ_ν at point $(3, 0)$, and all edges between u , v , w , and ρ_ν as straight-line segments. By induction, G_ν admits a leveling ℓ_ν such that (G_ν, ℓ_ν) has a $(3, 1)$ -flat weakly levelled planar drawing with span at most 4. Moreover, the coordinates of the path $(\lambda_\nu = u, \rho_\nu, r_\nu = w)$ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 36. Hence, by Lemma 36, we can obtain a crossing-free y -monotone polyline drawing of G_ν inside the region $R_{\lambda_\nu, \rho_\nu, r_\nu}$ with span at most 4.

Finally, we show how to construct a $(3, -1)$ -roof weakly levelled planar drawing of G_μ with span at most 4 (see Fig. 15c); the construction of a $(1, -3)$ -roof weakly levelled planar drawing of G_μ with span at most 4 is symmetric. We draw u at point $(1, -3)$, v at point $(2, 0)$, w at point $(4, -1)$, ρ_ν at point $(2, -2)$, and all edges between u , v , w , and ρ_ν as straight-line segments. By induction, G_ν admits a leveling ℓ_ν such that (G_ν, ℓ_ν) has a $(1, 1)$ -flat weakly levelled planar drawing with span at most 4. Moreover, the coordinates of the path $(\lambda_\nu = u, \rho_\nu, r_\nu = w)$ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 36. Hence, by Lemma 36, we



■ **Figure 16** Illustration for the proof of [Theorem 40](#).

can obtain a crossing-free y -monotone polyline drawing of G_ν inside the region $R_{\lambda_\nu, \rho_\nu, r_\nu}$ with span at most 4. ◀

This completes the proof. ◀

► **Theorem 39.** *Every 3-connected cycle-tree admits a 4-span weakly leveled planar drawing.*

Proof. Let G be a 3-connected cycle-tree and let (u, w) be an edge on the outer face of G . Since G can always be augmented with edges connecting a cycle vertex and an internal vertex to an internally-triangulated 3-connected cycle-tree having the same outer face as G , we will assume that G is internally triangulated. Let v be the internal vertex on the interior face incident to (u, w) . We obtain an almost-3-connected path-tree G' by removing the edge (u, w) .

Let \mathcal{T} be the SPQ-tree of G' with root node μ such that $u = \lambda_\mu$, $v = \rho_\mu$, and $w = r_\mu$. By [Lemma 37](#) and [Claim 38](#), G' admits a (1,1)-flat 4-span weakly leveled planar drawing Γ' . We construct a 4-span weakly leveled planar drawing Γ of G by reinserting the edge (u, w) with span 2 in Γ' by introducing a bend at the level of v . ◀

On the other hand, some 3-connected cycle-trees require span at least 4; see [Fig. 3b](#).


► **Theorem 40.** *For all $n \geq 43$, there exists an n -vertex 3-connected cycle-tree G such that every weakly leveled planar drawing of G has span greater than or equal to 4.*

Proof. The n -vertex cycle-tree G proving the lower bound is constructed as follows; see [Fig. 3b](#). Starting from a complete graph on four vertices $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$, insert three paths (u_1, \dots, u_{13}) , (w_1, \dots, w_{13}) , and (z_1, \dots, z_k) , where $k = n - 30 \geq 13$. Connect u_1 to v_1, v_2 , and v_3 ; for $i = 2, \dots, 13$ connect u_i to v_1 and v_3 ; connect w_1 to v_1, v_2 , and v_4 ; for $i = 2, \dots, 13$ connect w_i to v_1 and v_4 ; connect z_1 to v_2, v_3 , and v_4 ; and for $i = 2, \dots, k$ connect z_i to v_3 and v_4 .

Consider any weakly leveled planar drawing Γ of G and let ℓ be its associated leveling. Suppose first that one of the edges v_1v_3, v_1v_4, v_3v_4 has span 0 or 1. W.l.o.g., we may assume $\text{span}_\ell(v_1v_3) \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\ell(v_1) \leq \ell(v_3)$, as the case $\ell(v_3) < \ell(v_1)$ is analogous. Let A and B be the subsets of vertices among $\{u_1, \dots, u_{13}\}$ whose level is not smaller than $\ell(v_3)$ and not larger than $\ell(v_1)$, respectively. Note that $|A| \geq 7$ or $|B| \geq 7$. Suppose the former, as the other case is analogous. At most two vertices in A lie on the same level, as edges from v_1 and v_3 to three vertices in A on the same level would define a crossing (see [Fig. 16](#)). It follows that the vertices in A occupy at least four levels, not lower than the level of v_3 . Then the edge from v_1 to the vertex in A on the highest level has span at least 4.

We can thus assume that the edges v_1v_3, v_1v_4 , and v_3v_4 all have span at least 2 in Γ . Let v_s and v_t be the vertices among v_1, v_3 , and v_4 with the smallest and largest level, respectively; let v_m be the vertex among v_1, v_3 , and v_4 distinct from v_s and v_t . Then the span of the edge $v_s v_t$ in Γ is $\text{span}_\ell(v_s v_t) = \text{span}_\ell(v_s v_m) + \text{span}_\ell(v_s v_t)$, hence it is at least 4. ◀

► **Theorem 11.** *Every 3-connected cycle-tree admits a 4-span weakly leveled planar drawing. Also, for all $n \geq 43$, there exists an n -vertex 3-connected cycle-tree G such that every weakly leveled planar drawing of G has span greater than or equal to 4.*



■ **Figure 17** (a) An embedding \mathcal{E} of a cycle-tree G such that removing the vertices of the walk W delimiting the outer face one gets a tree T , which is represented by bold lines. (b) The augmentation of G ; the face f of \mathcal{E}_{G_W} is shaded gray.

Proof. The proof of the theorem immediately follows from [Theorems 39](#) and [40](#). ◀

► **Lemma 41.** *Weakly levelled planar graphs with span s have queue number at most $s + 1$.*


Proof. Let G be a weakly levelled planar graph with span at most s , and let Γ be a corresponding weakly levelled planar drawing of G . It is known that every levelled planar graph with span at most s admits a queue layout with s queues [[8](#), [Lemma 14](#)], in which vertices of the same level appear consecutively in the queue layout in the same left to right order as in the levelled drawing. This implies that all edges of Γ with span greater than zero fit in s queues. The remaining ones can be accommodated in a single additional queue, as they cannot be nested in the underlying linear order, completing the proof. ◀

C.2 General Cycle-Trees

► **Lemma 42.** *Let G be an n -vertex cycle-tree. Then G has an s -span weakly levelled planar drawing such that $s \in O(\log n)$.*

Proof. We can assume that G is connected, as distinct connected components of G can be laid out independently on the same levels. Then G has a plane embedding \mathcal{E} in which the outer face is delimited by a walk W , so that by removing the vertices of W and their incident edges from G one gets a tree T ; see [Fig. 17a](#). We now add the maximum number of edges in the outer face of \mathcal{E} , while preserving planarity, simplicity, and the property that every vertex of W is incident to the outer face. Further, we add the maximum number of edges inside the internal faces of \mathcal{E} , connecting vertices of W with vertices of W and with vertices of T . This latter augmentation is performed until no edge can be added as described while preserving planarity and simplicity. Clearly, this maintains the property that G is a cycle-tree; see [Fig. 17b](#).

Now the plan is as follows. We are going to remove some parts of G , so that G turns into a 3-connected cycle-tree H . We then apply [Theorem 11](#) to construct a weakly levelled planar drawing Λ of H with $O(1)$ span. We next insert $O(\log n)$ levels between any two consecutive




■ **Figure 18** (a) Removing the components of G outside C (except for the vertices and edges of C). (b) Removing the components of G inside C .

levels of Λ . We use such levels in order to re-introduce the parts of G that were previously removed, thus obtaining a weakly leveled planar drawing Γ of G with $O(\log n)$ span.


First, note that the subgraph G_W of G induced by the vertices of W is outerplanar (and 2-connected, because of the described augmentation). Let \mathcal{E}_{G_W} be the restriction of \mathcal{E} to G_W . Since T is connected, it lies inside a single internal face f of \mathcal{E}_{G_W} ; let C be the cycle delimiting f . We remove from G the vertices of G_W not in C and their incident edges. The removed vertices induced connected components H_W^1, \dots, H_W^k of G_W . For $i = 1, \dots, k$, we call *component of G outside C* the subgraph G_W^i of G induced by the vertices of H_W^i and the two vertices of C that are neighbors of vertices in H_W^i . Note that G_W^i is a maximal outerplanar graph, because of the initial augmentation. Fig. 18a shows the result of the described removal on the graph from Fig. 17b.

Second, we remove from G all the vertices of T that have at most one neighbor in C , as well as their incident edges. Fig. 18b shows the result of this removal on the graph from Fig. 18a. Let H be resulting graph and let \mathcal{E}_H be the restriction of \mathcal{E} to H . Note that the outer face of \mathcal{E}_H is delimited by C . We now prove that H is a cycle-tree, that is, by removing C from H one is left with a tree Y . This is equivalent to saying that the removal of the vertices of T actually removed entire subtrees of T , which we call *components of G inside C* .

Suppose, for a contradiction, that Y has multiple connected components; refer to Fig. 19a. Consider two vertices u and v that belong to distinct connected components of Y and that are incident to a common face f of \mathcal{E}_H . Choose u and v so that their shortest path distance in T is minimum. Since each of u and v has more than one neighbor in C , it follows that there exist four edges (u, w_1) , (u, w_2) , (v, z_1) , and (v, z_2) that belong to the boundary of f ; suppose w.l.o.g. that w_1, w_2, z_2 , and z_1 appear in this clockwise order along C . By planarity, the path P_{uv} that connects u and v in T lies inside f . By the minimality of the shortest path distance between u and v , all the internal vertices of P_{uv} do not belong to Y . Let u' be the vertex of P_{uv} adjacent to u . Then u' is incident to (at least) two faces of \mathcal{E} , one for each “side of P_{uv} ”. Formally, consider the bounded region R_1 of the plane delimited by the path $(w_1, u) \cup P_{uv} \cup (v, z_1)$ and by the path P_1 in C connecting z_1 with w_1 and not passing through w_2 ; then u' is incident to a face f_1 of \mathcal{E} inside R_1 . Analogously, consider the



■ **Figure 19** (a) Illustration for the proof that Y is a tree; the face f of \mathcal{E}_H is shaded gray. (b) Illustration for the proof that every vertex u of C has a neighbor in Y ; the face g is shaded gray.



■ **Figure 20** Illustration for the proof that H is 3-connected. In (a) u and v belong to C ; in (b) u and v belong to Y ; in (c) u belongs to C , v belongs to Y , and $v \neq u'$ or $u \notin \{z_1, z_2\}$; in (d) u belongs to C , v belongs to Y , $v = u'$, and $z_2 = u$.

bounded region R_2 of the plane delimited by the path $(w_2, u) \cup P_{uv} \cup (v, z_2)$ and by the path P_2 in C connecting z_2 with w_2 and not passing through w_1 ; then u' is incident to a face f_2 of \mathcal{E} inside R_2 . Since T is a tree, for $i = 1, 2$, the boundary of f_i contains at least one vertex x_i of C . Then u is adjacent to x_i , as otherwise the edge (u, x_i) could be inserted inside f_i , contradicting the maximality of the initial augmentation of G . However, this implies that u' is adjacent to two vertices of C , namely x_1 and x_2 , thus contradicting the fact that no internal vertex of P_{uv} belongs to Y . We now prove that H is 3-connected. In order to do that, we need the following two auxiliary statements.

- Statement (S1): Every vertex of C has a neighbor in Y . For a contradiction, suppose that a vertex u of C has no neighbor in Y ; refer to Fig. 19b. Since C is an induced cycle, it follows that u is incident to a single internal face g of \mathcal{E}_H and at least one vertex v of Y is incident to g . Then the edge (u, v) can be inserted inside g , contradicting the fact that no edge can be added connecting a vertex of W with a vertex of T inside an internal face of \mathcal{E} .
- Statement (S2): Every vertex of Y has at least two neighbors in C . This directly comes from the fact that vertices of T with at most one neighbor in C were removed from G .

We are now ready to prove that, for any two vertices u and v of H , there exist three paths Q_1 , Q_2 , and Q_3 between u and v that are vertex-disjoint, except at u and v . We distinguish three cases.

- Suppose first that u and v belong to C , as in Fig. 20a. Then Q_1 and Q_2 are the paths between u and v composing C . Let (u, u') and (v, v') be two distinct edges such that u' and v' belong to Y ; these edges exist by statement (S1). Then Q_3 is composed of (u, u') , of (v, v') , and of the path between u' and v' in Y .
- Suppose next that u and v belong to Y , as in Fig. 20b. Then Q_1 is the path in Y between u and v . Let (u, w_1) and (u, w_2) be two distinct edges such that w_1 and w_2 belong to C ,

and let (v, z_1) and (v, z_2) be two distinct edges such that z_1 and z_2 belong to C ; these edges exist by statement (S2). We can assume, w.l.o.g. up to renaming w_1 with w_2 , that C contains a path P_1 from w_1 and z_1 not passing through w_2 and z_2 and a path P_2 from w_2 and z_2 not passing through w_1 and z_1 . Then Q_2 is the path $(u, w_1) \cup P_1 \cup (v, z_1)$ and Q_3 is the path $(u, w_2) \cup P_2 \cup (v, z_2)$.

- Suppose finally that u belongs to C and v to Y , as in Figs. 20c and 20d. Let (u, u') be an edge such that u' belongs to Y ; this edge exists by statement (S1). Then Q_1 consists of (u, u') and of the path between u' and v in T . Let (v, z_1) and (v, z_2) be two distinct edges such that z_1 and z_2 belong to C ; these edges exist by statement (S2). Then C contains a path P_1 from z_1 to u not passing through z_2 (however z_2 might be an end-vertex of this path if $z_2 = u$) and a path P_2 from z_2 to u not passing through z_1 (however z_1 might be an end-vertex of this path if $z_1 = u$). If $v \neq u'$ or if $u \notin \{z_1, z_2\}$, as in Fig. 20c, then Q_2 is the path $(v, z_1) \cup P_1$ and Q_3 is the path $(v, z_2) \cup P_2$. Otherwise, we have $v = u'$ and, say, $z_2 = u$, as in Fig. 20d. Consider any vertex w of C different from u and z_1 . Let (w, w') be an edge such that w' belongs to Y ; this edge exists by statement (S1). Then C contains a path P'_1 from z_1 to u not passing through w and a path P'_2 from w to u not passing through z_1 . We have that Q_2 is the path $(v, z_1) \cup P'_1$ and Q_3 is the path composed of $P'_2 \cup (w, w')$ and of the path in Y between w' and v .


This concludes the proof that H is 3-connected. By Theorem 11, we have that H admits a weakly leveled planar drawing with span at most 5. By Lemma 2, we have that H admits a leveled planar drawing Λ with span at most 11. We now insert $2 + 2\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ levels between any two consecutive levels of Λ , thus turning Λ into a leveled planar drawing with span $O(\log n)$ such that every edge has span greater than or equal to $3 + 2\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$. We next show how to insert the vertices of the components of G outside and inside C in the levels of Λ , thus turning Λ into a leveled planar drawing Γ of G with span $O(\log n)$.

We start with the components of G outside C . Consider each of such components, G_W^i , and recall that G_W^i is a maximal outerplanar graph such that an edge (u_i, v_i) incident to the outer face of the outerplane embedding of G_W^i is already drawn in Λ , while all the other vertices and edges of G_W^i need to be added to Λ . Let $h_i \geq 3 + 2\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ be the span of (u_i, v_i) in Λ . Assume that $y(u_i) < y(v_i)$ and that the edge (u_i, v_i) has the outer face of Λ on the right, as the other cases are analogous. It follows from results by Biedl [1,2] that G_W^i admits a planar y -monotone poly-line grid drawing Γ_i such that: (i) the height of Γ_i (i.e., the number of grid rows intersected by Γ_i) is $h_i + 1$; (ii) the y -coordinate of u_i (resp. of v_i) is strictly smaller (resp. larger) than the y -coordinate of every other vertex of G_W^i ; and (iii) the edge (u_i, v_i) has the rest of Γ_i to the right. Then interpreting the grid rows of Γ_i as levels, we can plug Γ_i into Λ , without crossing the rest of Λ .

We next deal with the components of G inside C . As proved previously, the vertices of T with two neighbors in C induce a tree Y , hence the components of G inside C are subtrees of T . We are going to insert such components in Λ one at a time, in any order. We show how to insert in Λ any component X of G inside C . By construction, all the vertices of X have at most one neighbor in C . This property can be refined as in the following two claims.

▷ **Claim 43.** Every vertex of X is adjacent to exactly one vertex of C .

Proof. By construction, every vertex of X is adjacent to at most one vertex of C . Suppose, for a contradiction, that a vertex v of X is not adjacent to any vertex of C . Let f be any face of \mathcal{E} vertex v is incident to. Since T is a tree, at least one vertex v' of C is incident to f . Then the edge (v, v') can be inserted inside f , contradicting the fact that no edge can be added connecting a vertex of W with a vertex of T inside an internal face of \mathcal{E} . ◀



■ **Figure 21** (a) Illustration for Claim 44. The tree X is represented by thick lines, the region R_i is shaded gray, the face f_i is shaded dark gray. (b) If the edge between the reference vertex x and the base vertex u of a component X did not belong to G , then it could be added inside an internal face of \mathcal{E} .

▷ **Claim 44.** All the vertices of X are adjacent to the same vertex u of C .

Proof. By Claim 43, each vertex of X is adjacent to exactly one vertex of C . Suppose, for a contradiction, that two vertices v and v' of X are neighbors of distinct vertices u and u' of C , respectively. Refer to Fig. 21a. Let P be the path composed of the edges (u, v) , (u', v') , and of the path in X between v and v' . Consider the two bounded regions of the plane delimited by $C \cup P$. One of them, say R , does not contain vertices of Y . Let (u, y) be the edge of C on the boundary of R and let f be the face of \mathcal{E} that is incident to (u, y) and lies inside R . Since no vertex of X is neighbor of more than one vertex of C , it follows that R has at least two vertices of X on its boundary, say w and z . Assume, w.l.o.g., that u, y, w and z appear in this circular order along the boundary of f . By the planarity of \mathcal{E} , at least one of the edges (u, w) and (y, z) does not belong to G , contradicting the maximality of the initial augmentation of G . ◀

The vertex u of Claim 44 is called *base vertex* of the component X . The next claim is about the relationship of X with the rest of T .


▷ **Claim 45.** There exists a unique vertex x in T which does not belong to X and that is a neighbor of a vertex in X . Moreover, x belongs to Y .

Proof. First, T does not coincide with X since the tree Y contains vertices, by statement (S1). Since X is a subtree of T , there exists a unique vertex x of T that does not belong to X and that is a neighbor of a vertex in X . If x had at most one neighbor in C , it would belong to T , hence it has at least two neighbors in C , and so it does belong to Y . ◀

The vertex x of Claim 45 is called *reference vertex* of the component X . Further, the neighbor of x in X is called the *attachment vertex* of X . We have the following.

▷ **Claim 46.** The edge (x, u) belongs to G .

Proof. If the edge (x, u) did not belong to G , then it could be added to G , right outside the subgraph of G induced by $V(X) \cup \{x, u\}$; see Fig. 21b. However, this would contradict the fact that no edge can be added connecting a vertex of W with a vertex of T inside an internal face of \mathcal{E} . ◀



■ **Figure 22** (a) Start of the construction of the drawing of X . Region \mathcal{R}_{xu} is shaded light and dark gray, region \mathcal{R}_{au} is shaded dark gray only. (b) Construction of the drawing of Z . Region \mathcal{R}_{zu} is shaded light and dark gray, regions \mathcal{R}_{z_iu} are shaded dark gray only.

We are now ready to insert X in Λ . Refer to Fig. 22a. We root X at its attachment vertex a . By Claim 46, the edge (u, x) is in G , hence it already belongs to Λ . Let ℓ be the leveling associated with Λ and assume that $\ell(u) < \ell(x)$, as the other case is symmetric. Recall that the span of (u, x) is at least $3 + 2\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$, hence there are more than $1 + \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ levels larger than $\ell(u)$ and smaller than $\ell(x)$. We label ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k such levels from the highest (the level $\ell(x) - 1$) to the lowest (the level $\ell(u) + 1$). We draw a y -monotone curve γ_{xu} from x to u immediately to the right of the edge (u, x) . That is, the intersections of γ_{xu} with ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k are immediately to the right of the intersections of the edge (u, x) with such lines; further, γ_{xu} enters u and x immediately to the right of the edge (u, x) . Let \mathcal{R}_{xu} be the region delimited by the edge (u, x) and by γ_{xu} . The drawing of X and of the edges connecting the vertices of X with u and x will be contained in the interior of \mathcal{R}_{xu} . This, together with the planarity of such a drawing, implies the planarity of Λ after the insertion of X .

We insert X in Λ by means of an algorithm derived from a well-known algorithm for constructing planar straight-line grid drawings of trees with height at most $1 + \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ [4,5,21]. We start by placing a on ℓ_1 in the interior of \mathcal{R}_{xu} . We draw the edges (a, x) and (a, u) monotonically in the interior of \mathcal{R}_{xu} . We also draw a curve γ_{au} from a to u as follows. The curve γ_{au} leaves a horizontally towards the right, up to a point still inside \mathcal{R}_{xu} . Then it proceeds monotonically to u inside \mathcal{R}_{xu} to the right of the edge (a, u) . Let \mathcal{R}_{au} be the region delimited by the edge (a, u) and by γ_{au} . The drawing of X and of the edges connecting the vertices of X with u will be contained in (the interior or on the boundary of) \mathcal{R}_{xu} . This ensures that the drawing of X and of the edges connecting the vertices of X with u and x is contained in the interior of \mathcal{R}_{xu} .

The algorithm now works recursively. Assume that some tree Z has to be drawn in Λ , so that the root z of Z is already drawn in Λ , together with the edge (z, u) . Assume also that a region \mathcal{R}_{zu} has been defined that is delimited by the edge (z, u) on the left and whose remaining boundary consists of a horizontal segment s_z that leaves z towards the right and of a y -monotone curve between u and the endpoint of s_z different from z . These hypotheses are initially satisfied with $Z = X$, $z = a$, and $\mathcal{R}_{zu} = \mathcal{R}_{au}$. We show how to draw Z together with the edges connecting the vertices of Z with u inside or on the boundary of \mathcal{R}_{zu} .

If z is a leaf, then there is nothing to be drawn. Otherwise, let z_1, \dots, z_p be children of z and let Z_1, \dots, Z_p be the subtrees of Z rooted at z_1, \dots, z_p , respectively. Assume, w.l.o.g., that the number of vertices in Z_p is not smaller than the number of vertices in Z_i , for $i = 1, \dots, p - 1$. We proceed as follows; refer to Fig. 22b.

We place z_1 on the level $\ell(z) - 1$ in the interior of \mathcal{R}_{zu} . Then we draw the edges (z, z_1) and (z_1, u) monotonically. We also draw a curve γ_{z_1u} from z_1 to u as follows. The curve γ_{z_1u} leaves z_1 horizontally towards the right, up to a point still inside \mathcal{R}_{zu} . Then it proceeds monotonically to u inside \mathcal{R}_{zu} to the right of the edge (z_1, u) . Let \mathcal{R}_{z_1u} be the region delimited by the edge (z_1, u) and by γ_{z_1u} . A drawing of Z_1 and of the edges connecting the vertices of Z_1 with u is recursively constructed in \mathcal{R}_{z_1u} . This ensures that such a drawing is contained in the interior of \mathcal{R}_{zu} .

For $i = 2, \dots, p-1$, we place z_i on the level $\ell(z) - 1$, in the interior of \mathcal{R}_{zu} , to the right of $\gamma_{z_{i-1}u}$. Then we draw the edge (z, z_i) monotonically, in the interior of \mathcal{R}_{zu} , and to the right of the edge (z, z_{i-1}) . We also draw the edge (z_i, u) monotonically, in the interior of \mathcal{R}_{zu} , and to the right of $\gamma_{z_{i-1}u}$. We then draw a curve γ_{z_iu} from z_i to u , similarly as described previously for γ_{z_1u} . Let \mathcal{R}_{z_iu} be the region delimited by the edge (z_i, u) and by γ_{z_iu} . A drawing of Z_i and of the edges connecting the vertices of Z_i with u is recursively constructed in \mathcal{R}_{z_iu} . This ensures that such a drawing is contained in the interior of \mathcal{R}_{zu} .

Finally, we place z_p on the level $\ell(z)$, in the interior of the segment s_z . We draw the edge (z, z_p) as a horizontal segment that is part of s_z . We also draw the edge (z_p, u) monotonically, in the interior of \mathcal{R}_{zu} , and to the right of $\gamma_{z_{p-1}u}$ (the last condition is vacuous if $p = 1$), similarly as done for the edges (z_i, u) with $i = 1, \dots, p-1$. We also draw a curve γ_{z_pu} from z_p to u as follows. The curve γ_{z_pu} leaves z_p horizontally towards the right, up to a point still in the interior of s_z . Then it proceeds monotonically to u inside \mathcal{R}_{zu} to the right of the edge (z_p, u) . Let \mathcal{R}_{z_pu} be the region delimited by the edge (z_p, u) and by γ_{z_pu} . A drawing of Z_p and of the edges connecting the vertices of Z_p with u is recursively constructed in the interior or on the boundary of \mathcal{R}_{z_pu} . This ensures that such a drawing is contained in the interior of \mathcal{R}_{zu} .

Notice that the regions $\mathcal{R}_{z_1u}, \dots, \mathcal{R}_{z_pu}$ are disjoint, except at u , by construction, hence drawings of distinct subtrees of z do not cross one another. It remains to observe that the levels ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_k are sufficiently many for the recursion to work. This comes from an analysis similar to the one of the height of the cited planar straight-line grid drawings of trees [4, 5, 21]. Indeed, adopting the previous notation, the number of levels required for drawing Z is the maximum between the number of levels required for drawing Z_p , which contains at least one vertex less than Z , and 1 plus the number of levels required for drawing any of Z_1, \dots, Z_{p-1} . However, because Z_p contains at least as many vertices as any of Z_1, \dots, Z_{p-1} , each of such subtrees has less than half of the vertices of Z . Hence the number $l(n)$ of levels required for drawing an n -vertex tree satisfies the recurrence relationship $l(n) = \max\{l(n-1), 1 + l(\frac{n-1}{2})\}$, which solves to $l(n) \leq 1 + \log_2(n)$. The proof is concluded by recalling that there are more than $1 + \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ levels larger than $\ell(u)$ and smaller than $\ell(x)$. ◀

► **Lemma 47.** *There exists an n -vertex cycle-tree G such that every weakly leveled planar drawing of G has span in $\Omega(\log n)$.*

Proof. The n -vertex cycle-tree G proving the lower bound is constructed as follows; see Fig. 3c. Starting from a complete graph on four vertices $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$, insert two k -vertex complete binary trees T and T' , where $k+1$ is the largest power of two such that $k \leq \frac{n-4}{2}$. Add $n-2k-4$ further leaves adjacent to the root of T' , so that G has n vertices. Finally, connect the root of T to v_1, v_2 , and v_3 , and the root of T' to v_1, v_2 , and v_4 .

In any planar drawing of G , we have that T lies inside the cycle (v_1, v_2, v_3) , or T' lies inside the cycle (v_1, v_2, v_4) , or both. Hence, it suffices to prove that any weakly leveled planar drawing of T (and T') has height $\Omega(\log n)$, in order to prove that any weakly leveled planar

drawing of G has *span* $\Omega(\log n)$; indeed, if, say, T lies inside the cycle (v_1, v_2, v_3) , then at least two edges of this cycle have *span* $\Omega(\log n)$.

Suppose that T has a weakly leveled planar drawing with height h , for some $h > 0$. Then it admits a leveled planar drawing with height at most $2h + 1$, by [Lemma 2](#). From this, it follows that T has pathwidth at most $2h + 1$ [7]. However, the pathwidth of T is in $\Omega(\log n)$, since T has $k \in \Omega(n)$ nodes and a complete binary tree with k nodes has pathwidth $\Omega(\log k)$; see [3, 20]. It follows that $h \in \Omega(\log n)$, as desired. ◀

► **Theorem 14.** *Every n -vertex cycle-tree has an s -span weakly leveled planar drawing such that $s \in O(\log n)$. Also, there exists an n -vertex cycle-tree such that every weakly leveled planar drawing of G has *span* in $\Omega(\log n)$.*

Proof. The proof of the theorem follows directly from [Lemmas 42](#) and [47](#). ◀

C.3 Planar Graphs with Treewidth 2

► **Lemma 48.** *Let G be an n -vertex planar graph with treewidth 2. Then G has an s -span weakly leveled planar drawing such that $s \in O(\sqrt{n})$.*

Proof. Biedl [1] proved that every n -vertex planar graph G with treewidth 2 admits a planar y -monotone grid drawing Γ with $O(\sqrt{n})$ height, that is, the drawing touches $O(\sqrt{n})$ horizontal grid lines. Interpreting the placement of the vertices along these lines as a leveling shows that G admits a leveled planar drawing Γ with height, and hence *span*, $O(\sqrt{n})$. ◀

The following lower bound uses a construction by Frati [13, 14]. Note that $2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$ is larger than any poly-logarithmic function of n , but smaller than any polynomial function of n .

► **Lemma 49.** *There exists an n -vertex planar graph G with treewidth 2 such that every weakly leveled planar drawing of G has *span* in $2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$.*

Proof. Frati [13, 14] proved that there is an m -vertex planar graph H_m with treewidth 2 requiring $2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log m})}$ height in every planar y -monotone (in fact, in every poly-line) grid drawing. Our lower bound graph G is constructed from a complete bipartite graph $K_{2,3}$ with vertex families $\{u_1, u_2\}$ and $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$, by inserting three copies $H_k^1, H_k^2,$ and H_k^3 of H_k , with $k = \lfloor \frac{n-2}{3} \rfloor$, so that a vertex of H_k^i is identified with v_i , for $i = 1, 2, 3$. If $n \not\equiv 2 \pmod 3$, one or two further vertices can be made adjacent to any vertex of G , so that it has n vertices.

In any weakly leveled planar drawing Γ of G , for some i, j, ℓ such that $\{i, j, \ell\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$, we have that H_k^i lies inside the 4-cycle (u_1, v_j, u_2, v_ℓ) . Hence, it suffices to prove that the drawing Γ^i of H_k^i in Γ has height $2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$, in order to prove that Γ has *span* $2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$, as the former implies that one of the edges of the 4-cycle (u_1, v_j, u_2, v_ℓ) has *span* $2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$.

Suppose that Γ^i has height h . By [Lemma 2](#), there exists a leveled planar drawing of H_k^i with height at most $2h$. By the results of Biedl [1, 2], we have that H_k^i admits a planar y -monotone grid drawing with height at most $2h$. Frati's lower bound [14] then implies that $h \in 2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log k})}$. The proof is completed by observing that $k \in \Omega(n)$. ◀

► **Theorem 15.** *Every n -vertex planar graph with treewidth 2 has an s -span weakly leveled planar drawing such that $s \in O(\sqrt{n})$. Also, there exists an n -vertex planar graph with treewidth 2 such that every weakly leveled planar drawing of G has *span* in $2^{\Omega(\sqrt{\log n})}$.*

Proof. The proof of the theorem immediately follows from [Lemmas 48](#) and [49](#). ◀

References for the Appendix

- 1 Therese Biedl. Small drawings of outerplanar graphs, series-parallel graphs, and other planar graphs. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 45(1):141–160, 2011. doi:10.1007/s00454-010-9310-z.
- 2 Therese Biedl. Height-preserving transformations of planar graph drawings. In Christian A. Duncan and Antonios Symvonis, editors, *22nd International Symposium on Graph Drawing, GD 2014, September 24-26, 2014, Würzburg, Germany*, volume 8871 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 380–391. Springer, 2014. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-45803-7_32.
- 3 Hans L. Bodlaender. A partial k -arboretum of graphs with bounded treewidth. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 209(1-2):1–45, 1998. doi:10.1016/S0304-3975(97)00228-4.
- 4 Timothy M. Chan. Tree drawings revisited. *Discret. Comput. Geom.*, 63(4):799–820, 2020. doi:10.1007/S00454-019-00106-W.
- 5 Pierluigi Crescenzi, Giuseppe Di Battista, and Adolfo Piperno. A note on optimal area algorithms for upward drawings of binary trees. *Comput. Geom.*, 2:187–200, 1992. doi:10.1016/0925-7721(92)90021-J.
- 6 Giuseppe Di Battista and Roberto Tamassia. Algorithms for plane representations of acyclic digraphs. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 61:175–198, 1988. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(88)90123-5.
- 7 Vida Dujmović, Michael R. Fellows, Matthew Kitching, Giuseppe Liotta, Catherine McCartin, Naomi Nishimura, Prabhakar Ragde, Frances A. Rosamond, Sue Whitesides, and David R. Wood. On the parameterized complexity of layered graph drawing. *Algorithmica*, 52(2):267–292, 2008. doi:10.1007/s00453-007-9151-1.
- 8 Vida Dujmović, Attila Pór, and David R. Wood. Track layouts of graphs. *Discret. Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 6(2):497–522, 2004. doi:10.46298/DMTCS.315.
- 9 Peter Eades, Qing-Wen Feng, and Xuemin Lin. Straight-line drawing algorithms for hierarchical graphs and clustered graphs. In Stephen C. North, editor, *Graph Drawing, Symposium on Graph Drawing, GD '96, Berkeley, California, USA, September 18-20, Proceedings*, volume 1190 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 113–128. Springer, 1996. doi:10.1007/3-540-62495-3_42.
- 10 Peter Eades, Qing-Wen Feng, Xuemin Lin, and Hiroshi Nagamochi. Straight-line drawing algorithms for hierarchical graphs and clustered graphs. *Algorithmica*, 44(1):1–32, 2006. doi:10.1007/S00453-004-1144-8.
- 11 Peter Eades, Brendan D. McKay, and Nicholas C. Wormald. On an edge crossing problem. In *9th Australian Computer Science Conference, ACSC 1986, January, 1986, Canberra, Australia*, pages 327–334, 1986.
- 12 Fedor V. Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, Saket Saurabh, and Meirav Zehavi. *Kernelization: Theory of Parameterized Preprocessing*. Cambridge University Press, 2019. doi:10.1017/9781107415157.
- 13 Fabrizio Frati. Improved lower bounds on the area requirements of series-parallel graphs. In Ulrik Brandes and Sabine Cornelsen, editors, *Graph Drawing - 18th International Symposium, GD 2010, Konstanz, Germany, September 21-24, 2010. Revised Selected Papers*, volume 6502 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 220–225. Springer, 2010. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-18469-7_20.
- 14 Fabrizio Frati. Lower bounds on the area requirements of series-parallel graphs. *Discret. Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 12(5):139–174, 2010. doi:10.46298/dmtcs.500.
- 15 Lenwood S. Heath and Arnold L. Rosenberg. Laying out graphs using queues. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 21(5):927–958, 1992. doi:10.1137/0221055.
- 16 John E. Hopcroft and J. K. Wong. Linear time algorithm for isomorphism of planar graphs (preliminary report). In Robert L. Constable, Robert W. Ritchie, Jack W. Carlyle, and Michael A. Harrison, editors, *6th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 1974, April 30 - May 2, 1974, Seattle, Washington, USA*, pages 172–184. ACM, 1974. doi:10.1145/800119.803896.
- 17 Michael Jünger, Sebastian Leipert, and Petra Mutzel. Level planarity testing in linear time. In Sue Whitesides, editor, *6th International Symposium on Graph Drawing, GD 1998, August*

- 13-15, 1998, Montréal, Canada, volume 1547 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 224–237. Springer, 1998. doi:10.1007/3-540-37623-2_17.
- 18 Abraham Lempel, Shimon Even, and Israel Cederbaum. An algorithm for planarity testing of graphs. In *International Symposium on Graph Theory and its Applications, Rome, 1966*, pages 215–232. Gordon & Breach, 1967.
- 19 János Pach and Géza Tóth. Monotone drawings of planar graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 46(1):39–47, 2004. doi:10.1002/JGT.10168.
- 20 Petra Scheffler. *Die Baumweite von Graphen als ein Maß für die Kompliziertheit algorithmischer Probleme*. PhD thesis, Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Berlin, 1989.
- 21 Yossi Shiloach. *Linear and Planar Arrangements of Graphs*. PhD thesis, Weizmann Institute of Science, 1976.