

Layered Graph Drawing with Few Gaps and Few Crossings

Alexander Dobler ✉ 

TU Wien, Austria

Jakob Roithinger ✉

TU Wien, Austria

Abstract

We consider the task of drawing a graph on multiple horizontal layers, where each node is assigned a layer, and each edge connects nodes of different layers. Known algorithms determine the orders of nodes on each layer to minimize crossings between edges, increasing readability. Usually, this is done by repeated one-sided crossing minimization for each layer. These algorithms allow edges that connect nodes on non-neighboring layers, called “long” edges, to weave freely throughout layers of the graph, creating many “gaps” in each layer. As shown in a recent work on hive plots – a similar visualization drawing vertices on multiple layers – it can be beneficial to restrict the number of such gaps. We extend existing heuristics and exact algorithms for one-sided crossing minimization in a way that restricts the number of allowed gaps. The extended heuristics maintain approximation ratios, and in an experimental evaluation we show that they perform well with respect to the number of resulting crossings when compared with exact ILP formulations.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Mathematics of computing → Permutations and combinations; Theory of computation → Design and analysis of algorithms


Keywords and phrases One-Sided Crossing Minimization, Layered Graph Drawing, Integer Linear Programming, Approximation Algorithms

Funding *Alexander Dobler*: Supported by the Vienna Science and Technology Fund (WWTF) under grant 10.47379/ICT19035

1 Introduction

Drawing graphs is a non-trivial task, and many visualization approaches exist. One such approach, known as *layered graph drawing*, draws the nodes on horizontal layers $L = \{L_1, L_2, \dots, L_\ell\}$, each edge connects nodes of different layers. Sugiyama et al. pioneered the automation of such drawings [10] in the well-known *Sugiyama-framework* consisting of multiple steps. The first step assigns nodes to the ℓ layers such that nodes connected by an edge are on different layers (Figure 1a). In the next step so-called *long edges* connecting nodes u and v of non-neighbouring layers L_i and L_j , $i < j - 1$, are replaced by a path of length $j - i$. The newly created *dummy* nodes are assigned to layers $i + 1, i + 2, \dots, j - 1$ (Figure 1b). Original nodes are called *real nodes*. After this process each edge connects nodes of adjacent layers. In the next step edge crossings are reduced by permuting the nodes of each layer. Usually, this is performed for neighboring layers, whereby the order of nodes in one layer is fixed and the other layer is permuted. This is known as one-sided crossing minimization (OSCM) [3]. OSCM is performed iteratively, “up” and “down” the layers of the graph, i.e. for $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1$ layer L_i is fixed and layer L_{i+1} is permuted. Then, for $i = \ell, \ell - 1, \dots, 2$, layer L_i is fixed and layer L_{i-1} is permuted. Several such “up” and “down” runs may be performed until reaching a termination condition. The last step replaces dummy nodes by the original edges, and assigns x -coordinates to nodes.

We are concerned with the second step of the above framework. In existing algorithms, dummy and real nodes are treated equally during the crossing minimization step. This can



■ **Figure 1** (a) A layered graph drawing. (b) Long edges are replaced by paths of dummy nodes, shown as violet squares. (c) A drawing of two layers with the two node orderings π_1 and π_2 such that π_2 has 4 gaps (shown with dashed rectangles), two of which are side gaps.

lead to many gaps in the resulting visualization in each layer. Formally, a gap in layer L_i is a maximal consecutive sequence of dummy nodes (Figure 1c). We argue that this hinders readability; thus, we extend algorithms for OSCM to only allow (1) *side gaps*, that is, one gap on the left and one gap on the right of a layer, or (2) at most k gaps for each layer. Gaps have already been motivated by Nöllenburg and Wallinger for hive plots [8], which is essentially a circular variant of the Sugiyama framework with some additional features. Nöllenburg and Wallinger have introduced gaps at fixed positions of each layer, including the variant of side gaps. We extend their work by introducing the variant of k gaps, where the gaps can be placed arbitrarily. Furthermore, we consider the problem from a more theoretical perspective, proving approximation ratios of our algorithms. For both variants, side gaps and k gaps, we propose approximations and exact algorithms that are experimentally evaluated.

Related work. The well-known Sugiyama framework [10] for layered graph drawing serves as the main motivation of this work. As mentioned, a key step of this framework is to minimize crossings between two adjacent layers by permuting the order of nodes of one layer while keeping the second layer fixed, which is a known NP-hard problem called one-sided crossing minimization (OSCM) [3]. There exist heuristics with approximation guarantees [3, 10, 7], FPT-algorithms parameterized by the number of crossings [2, 6], and exact algorithms based on integer linear programs [5].

A restricted variant of OSCM has already been studied by Forster [4], where the relative order of node pairs can be restricted; thus the computed order has to conform to a given partial order. This is different to restrictions on gaps, which cannot be represented by partial orders. Further, Nöllenburg and Wallinger [8] have considered gaps in a circular drawing style of graphs, called *hive plots*. Our theoretical results are of independent interest to their work, and we extend their setting of gaps at fixed positions to gaps at arbitrary positions.

Gaps can also be regarded as groups of edges that can be bundled together. Edge bundling has already been applied in the context of layered graph drawing [9].

Structure. We state the formal problems for our OSCM-variants in Section 2. In Section 3 and Section 4 we give polynomial time approximation algorithms for the respective problems. Exact ILP formulations are given in Section 5, and an experimental evaluation of selected algorithms is presented in Section 6. The source code is available online [1].

2 Preliminaries

Permutations. We treat permutations π as lists of a set X . Two permutations π, π' of disjoint sets can be concatenated by $\pi \star \pi'$. For $x, y \in \pi$ we write $x \prec_{\pi} y$ if x comes before y in π . For $X' \subseteq X$, $\pi[X']$ is the *induced* permutation on X' , i.e., for all $x, y \in X'$, $x \prec_{\pi} y$ iff. $x \prec_{\pi[X']} y$. Further, $\Pi(X)$ denotes the set of all permutations of X , and $\pi[i : j]$ is the set of elements in π whose index is between i and j inclusively, using 1-indexing.

One-sided crossing minimization. The problems discussed in this paper have as input a bipartite graph $G = (V_1 \dot{\cup} V_2, E)$, $E \subset V_1 \times V_2$. We set $n := |V_1 \cup V_2|$ and $m := |E|$. The classic one-sided crossing minimization (OSCM) problem is given G and a permutation π_1 of V_1 . The task is to find a permutation π_2 of V_2 that minimizes the number of edge crossings in a two-layer straight-line drawing of G such that nodes in V_1 are ordered according to π_1 on the bottom layer and nodes in V_2 are ordered according to π_2 on the top layer. Such crossings can be determined combinatorially by π_1 and π_2 ; namely, edges $e = (u_1, u_2)$ and $e' = (v_1, v_2)$, $u_i, v_i \in V_i$, cross w.r.t. π_1 and π_2 if $u_1 \prec_{\pi_1} v_1$ and $u_2 \succ_{\pi_2} v_2$, or $u_1 \succ_{\pi_1} v_1$ and $u_2 \prec_{\pi_2} v_2$. Let $\text{cr}(G, \pi_1, \pi_2)$ be the number of crossings determined in such a way. Given G and π_1 , OSCM asks for π_2 minimizing $\text{cr}(G, \pi_1, \pi_2)$. Throughout the paper we assume π_1 as fixed. By slightly abusing the notation of cr , we furthermore define for $S, S' \in V_2$, $S \cap S' = \emptyset$ the value $\text{cr}(G, S, S')$ as follows. Let π_2 be any permutation such that all nodes in S come before all nodes in S' . The value $\text{cr}(G, S, S')$ is the number of pairs e, e' that cross w.r.t. π_1 and π_2 such that $e \cap S \neq \emptyset$ and $e' \cap S' \neq \emptyset$.

We extend the OSCM problem by restricting the amount of allowed *gaps*. For this, we note that V_2 consists of the disjoint union of V_2^r and V_2^{dm} , where V_2^r is the set of *real* nodes and V_2^{dm} is the set of *dummy* nodes obtained by the preprocessing steps performed by the Sugiyama framework [10]. It is important to note that dummy nodes have degree one, which we exploit in all our algorithms. A gap in π_2 is a maximal consecutive sequence of dummy nodes, and $\text{gaps}(\pi_2)$ is the amount of gaps in π_2 . Furthermore, a *side gap* is a gap that either contains the leftmost or rightmost dummy nodes in π_2 , π_2 is a *side-gap permutation* if all of its gaps are side-gaps. In our restricted OSCM variants, we either allow only side gaps in π_2 , or at most k gaps overall. The formal problems are given below, starting with side gaps.

► **Problem 1 (OSCM-SG).** Given a bipartite graph $G = (V_1 \dot{\cup} V_2, E)$ and a permutation π_1 of V_1 , find a permutation $\pi_2 \in \Pi(V_2)$ such that π_2 is a side-gap permutation and $\text{cr}(G, \pi_1, \pi_2)$ is minimal.

► **Problem 2 (OSCM- k G).** Given a bipartite graph $G = (V_1 \dot{\cup} V_2, E)$, a permutation π_1 of V_1 , and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, find a permutation $\pi_2 \in \Pi(V_2)$ such that $\text{gaps}(\pi_2) \leq k$ and $\text{cr}(G, \pi_1, \pi_2)$ is minimal.

Clearly, both problems are NP-hard as they are equivalent to classic OSCM which is NP-hard [3], if we have no dummy nodes.

3 Approximation Algorithms for OSCM-SG

We show that any approximation algorithm for the classic OSCM problem can be transformed to an approximation algorithm for OSCM-SG with the same approximation ratio. First, we show in the below lemma that there will never be edge crossings that involve two edges that are both incident to a dummy node in an optimal solution to OSCM-SG and OSCM- k G.

► **Lemma 3.1.** *Given π_1, π_2 such that a pair of edges $e, e' \in V_1 \times V_2^{\text{dm}}$ crosses, there is π'_2 such that (1) $cr(G, \pi_1, \pi'_2) < cr(G, \pi_1, \pi_2)$, (2) $gaps(\pi'_2) \leq gaps(\pi_2)$, and (3) if π_2 is a side-gap permutation, so is π'_2 .*

Proof. Let π_1, π_2 be such that a pair of edges $e, e' \in V_1 \times V_2^{\text{dm}}$ crosses. Let $e = (u, v)$ and let $e' = (u', v')$, hence $v, v' \in V_2^{\text{dm}}$. We show that exchanging v and v' in π_2 does not increase the number of crossings. The statement then follows by induction, repeatedly exchanging such v and v' in π_2 . Let π'_2 be the permutation after exchanging v and v' . We consider different cases (note that v and v' have degree one).

- An edge e'' that crosses with both e and e' with respect to π_1 and π'_2 , also crosses with both with respect to π_1 and π_2 .
 - An edge e'' that crosses with e with respect to π_1 and π'_2 , crosses with e' with respect to π_1 and π_2 .
 - An edge e'' that crosses with e' with respect to π_1 and π'_2 , crosses with e with respect to π_1 and π_2 .
 - The edges e and e' do not cross w.r.t. π_1 and π'_2 .
 - Edge crossings between edges that are both not incident to neither v nor v' stay the same.
- Hence, we did not increase the number of crossings by exchanging v and v' in π_2 . ◀

Due to the above lemma, we fix in the rest of the paper π_2^{dm} as the order of V_2^{dm} determined by sorting V_2^{dm} ascending by their neighbor's position in π_1 . Dummy nodes with the same neighbor can be ordered arbitrarily. If for any solution π_2 , $\pi_2[V_2^{\text{dm}}] \neq \pi_2^{\text{dm}}$, we can transform π_2 into π'_2 having properties (1)-(3) of Lemma 3.1 and with $\pi'_2[V_2^{\text{dm}}] = \pi_2^{\text{dm}}$.

Now, given an algorithm \mathcal{A} for OSCM with approximation ratio α , we get an approximation algorithm for OSCM-SG with the same approximation ratio, as given below.

► **Theorem 3.2.** *Let \mathcal{A} be an algorithm for OSCM with approximation ratio α and runtime $\mathcal{O}(f(n, m))$. Then there exists an algorithm \mathcal{B} for OSCM-SG with approximation ratio α and runtime $\mathcal{O}(f(n, m) + m)$.*

Proof. Given \mathcal{A} , we define \mathcal{B} . First, we apply \mathcal{A} to the OSCM instance $(G[V_1 \cup V_2^{\text{r}}], \pi_1)$ and obtains a permutation of V_2^{r} . This determines the order $\pi_2[V_2^{\text{r}}]$ of real nodes. It remains to place the nodes in V_2^{dm} to the left or right of $\pi_2[V_2^{\text{r}}]$. For a single node $u \in V_2^{\text{dm}}$, placing u left of $\pi_2[V_2^{\text{r}}]$ results in less crossings than placing it to right if $cr(\{u\}, V_2^{\text{r}}) < cr(V_2^{\text{r}}, \{u\})$. Notice that it follows that then $cr(\{u'\}, V_2^{\text{r}}) < cr(V_2^{\text{r}}, \{u'\})$ for all $u' \in V_2^{\text{dm}}$ with $u' \prec_{\pi_2^{\text{dm}}} u$. Thus it is enough to find the rightmost u in π_2^{dm} such that $cr(\{u\}, V_2^{\text{r}}) < cr(V_2^{\text{r}}, \{u\})$. Let $\pi_2^{\text{dm}} = A \star (u) \star B$, where π_2^{dm} is defined by the neighbors of dummy nodes in π_1 (A and B can be empty). We place $A \star (u)$ before $\pi_2[V_2^{\text{r}}]$ and B after $\pi_2[V_2^{\text{r}}]$. The node u can be found by binary search. This can be done in $\mathcal{O}(m)$ time if we can query $cr(\{u\}, V_2^{\text{r}})$ and $cr(V_2^{\text{r}}, \{u\})$ in constant time, which is possible by precomputing the sum of degrees of nodes in each suffix and prefix of π_1 . It is left to show that the approximation ratio α remains. Consider an optimal solution π_2^* to the OSCM-SG instance (G, π_1) . Notice that a dummy node u is in the left side gap in π_2^* if and only if it is in the left side gap in the permutation π_2 computed by \mathcal{B} . This is the case as $cr(\{u\}, V_2^{\text{r}})$ is independent of the order of real nodes and \mathcal{B} placed u such that it minimizes the number of crossings involving the edge incident to u . Due to \mathcal{A} being an α -approximation algorithm, crossings between edges $e, e' \in V_1 \times V_2^{\text{r}}$ are at most α times more in π_2 when compared with π_2^* . The remaining crossings sum up to the same amount. Thus, \mathcal{B} is an α -approximation. ◀

The key idea for the algorithm \mathcal{B} is that we can in polynomial time compute the optimal placement of gap nodes and this placement is independent of the ordering of real nodes. If

\mathcal{A} is for example the median heuristic [3], then Theorem 3.2 gives us a polynomial time 3-approximation algorithm for OSCM-SG. For an exact algorithm, we can substitute for \mathcal{A} any exact algorithm for OSCM ($\alpha = 1$) such as ILP formulations [5].

4 Approximation Algorithms for OSCM- k G

Adapting heuristics for OSCM- k G is not as straight-forward. This is because once we have determined $\pi_2[V_2^r]$, we have to consider all possibilities of inserting dummy nodes without having more than k gaps. Furthermore, now the optimal placement of dummy nodes is dependent on $\pi_2[V_2^r]$. We will only be able to extend OSCM heuristics with the following property.

► **Definition 4.1.** *Let \mathcal{A} be an algorithm for OSCM, (G, π_1) be any instance of OSCM with $G = (V_1 \dot{\cup} V_2, E)$. Consider a set of new nodes V' , $E' \subseteq V_1 \times V'$, and $G' = (V_1 \dot{\cup} (V_2 \cup V'), E \cup E')$. Now apply \mathcal{A} to (G, π_1) and to (G', π_1) to obtain solutions π_2 and π'_2 , respectively. The algorithm \mathcal{A} is dummy-independent if $\pi_2[V_2] = \pi'_2[V_2]$ always holds.*

Examples of dummy-independent algorithms are for example the barycenter-, and median-heuristic. By plugging $V' = V_2^{\text{dm}}$ in the above definition, we see that the order of real nodes computed by \mathcal{A} is independent of the dummy nodes in G , when \mathcal{A} is dummy-independent.

We can now extend any dummy-independent approximation algorithm \mathcal{A} to OSCM- k G maintaining the approximation ratio.

► **Theorem 4.2.** *Let \mathcal{A} be a dummy-independent algorithm for OSCM with approximation ratio α and runtime $\mathcal{O}(f(n, m))$. Then there exists an algorithm \mathcal{B} for OSCM- k G with approximation ratio α and runtime $\mathcal{O}(f(n, m) + |V_2^r| \cdot |V_2^{\text{dm}}|^2 \cdot k)$.*

Proof. The algorithm \mathcal{B} first determines $\pi_2^r := \pi_2[V_2^r]$ by applying \mathcal{A} to the OSCM instance $(G[V_1 \cup V_2^r], \pi_1)$. We define a dynamic program to merge the two orders π_2^r and π_2^{dm} . The dynamic programming table DP contains entries $DP[g, i, j]$ which represents the minimum number of crossings between edge pairs e, e' , e being incident to V_2^r and e' being incident to V_2^{dm} , using at most g gaps when merging the first i nodes in π_2^r and the first j nodes in π_2^{dm} ; further, g goes from 0 to k , i goes from 0 to $|V_2^r|$, and j goes from 0 to $|V_2^{\text{dm}}|$. The base cases are

- $DP[0, i, 0] = 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq |V_2^r|$,
- $DP[0, i, j] = \infty$ for $0 \leq i \leq |V_2^r|$, $1 \leq j \leq |V_2^{\text{dm}}|$,

and the transitions for $g > 0$ can be computed as

$$DP[g, i, j] = \min_{0 \leq j' \leq j} [DP[g-1, i, j'] + \text{cr}(G, \pi_2^r[1 : i], \pi_2^{\text{dm}}[j'+1 : j]) + \text{cr}(G, \pi_2^{\text{dm}}[j'+1 : j], \pi_2^r[i+1 : |V_2^r|])].$$

The optimal number of crossings can be read from $DP[k, |V_2^r|, |V_2^{\text{dm}}|]$, and the corresponding permutation can be reconstructed from the entries in DP . The runtime can be achieved by precomputing $\text{cr}(G, \pi_2^r[1 : i], \pi_2^{\text{dm}}[j'+1 : j])$ and $\text{cr}(G, \pi_2^{\text{dm}}[j'+1 : j], \pi_2^r[i+1 : |V_2^r|])$.

For correctness, consider an optimal solution π_2^{opt} with c crossings. By Lemma 3.1 no edge pairs incident to V_2^{dm} cross. Now contract each set of dummy nodes that appear in a gap together, obtaining the graph G' . Apply \mathcal{A} to (G', π_1) , obtaining a solution π'_2 with at most $\alpha \cdot c$ crossings. Now revert the contraction and replace each contracted node by its original sequence of dummy nodes in π_2' . The newly obtained permutation is in the solution space of the dynamic program because $\pi_2' = \pi_2'[V_2^r]$ (\mathcal{A} is dummy-independent), hence we have an α -approximation. ◀

5 Integer Linear Programs

In order to compare the results of the heuristic algorithms to an optimal solution, we defined an integer linear program (ILP) for the OSCM- k G problem. There is no need to develop a specialized formulation for OSCM-SG since we can determine the relative order of real nodes using an existing ILP formulation, for example the one defined in [5], and apply the algorithm described in Theorem 3.2.

5.1 OSCM- k G

Exact algorithms for OSCM are not dummy-independent. Hence, Theorem 4.2 cannot be applied to such algorithms. Hence, we propose an exact ILP formulation for OSCM- k G.

The key insight which will make this formulation efficient is Lemma 3.1, which already determines the order π_2^{dm} of dummy nodes. We will count the number of times there are real nodes between a pair of adjacent (in π_2^{dm}) dummy nodes, which will correspond to the number of gaps minus one. Thus let $N = \{(u, v) \mid u, v \in V_2^{\text{dm}}, u \text{ is the predecessor of } v \text{ in } \pi_2^{\text{dm}}\}$. For an instance (G, π_1, k) of OSCM- k G, let $V_2 = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_p\}$. The formulation (given in Integer Linear Program 1) makes use of the following variables with the given semantics.

- A binary variable x_{ij} for each $1 \leq i, j \leq p, i \neq j$. We have $x_{ij} = 1$ if and only if $v_i \prec_{\pi_2} v_j$.
- A binary variable g_{ij} for each $(v_i, v_j) \in N$. We have $g_{ij} = 1$ if there is a real node between v_i and v_j in π_2 .

In all equations below, assume that i, j, k are pairwise different.

► Integer Linear Program 1 (OSCM- k G).

$$\text{minimize: } \sum_{v_i, v_j \in V_2} x_{ij} \cdot \text{cr}(G, \{v_i\}, \{v_j\}) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{subject to: } x_{ij} + x_{ji} = 1 \quad v_i, v_j \in V_2 \quad (2)$$

$$x_{ij} + x_{jk} + x_{ik} \leq 3 \quad v_i, v_j, v_k \in V_2 \quad (3)$$

$$x_{ij} = 1 \quad (v_i, v_j) \in N \quad (4)$$

$$g_{ij} \geq x_{ik} + x_{kj} - 1 \quad (v_i, v_j) \in N, v_k \in V_2^r \quad (5)$$

$$\sum_{(v_i, v_j) \in N} g_{ij} \leq k - 1 \quad (6)$$

The constraints in Integer Linear Program 1 have the following meanings:

- (2) ensures the anti-symmetry of π_2 .
- (3) ensures the transitivity of π_2 .
- (4) ensures that the order of virtual nodes is as in Lemma 3.1.
- (5) ensures that g_{ij} assumes 1 if there is a real node v_k between v_i and v_j in π_2 .
- (6) limits the total amount of gaps to k .

The objective function minimizes the total number of edge crossings by summing the values $\text{cr}(G, \{v_i\}, \{v_j\})$ for i, j where $x_{ij} = 1$, where $\text{cr}(G, \{v_i\}, \{v_j\})$ is the number of edge crossings between edge pairs incident to v_i and v_j when v_i is placed before v_j . The permutation π_2 can be read off from the values of the x_{ij} variables. That is, $v_i \prec_{\pi_2} v_j$ iff $x_{ij} = 1$.

Algorithm 1 GENERATE-RANDOM-2-LAYER-GRAPH

Input: A positive integer n specifying how many nodes should be generated for each layer. A floating point number $0 \leq f_{\text{dm}} \leq 1$ specifying what fraction of nodes generated should be dummy. A positive number deg_{avg} specifying the average degree a real node should have.

Output: A “random” two layered graph G with the given specifications.

- 1 $n_{\text{dm}} = \lfloor n \cdot f_{\text{dm}} \rfloor$;
 - 2 $n_{\text{r}} = n - n_{\text{dm}}$;
 - 3 initialize an empty 2-layered graph G ;
 - 4 add n_{dm} real nodes to both layers of G ;
 - 5 choose $\lfloor n_{\text{r}} \cdot \max(n_{\text{r}}, deg_{\text{avg}}) \rfloor$ edges from $V_1^{\text{r}} \times V_2^{\text{r}}$ uniformly at random and add them to G ;
 - 6 create n_{dm} dummy nodes in the first and second layer ;
 - 7 add edges from each of these dummy nodes to a random other node in the opposite layer, ensuring that dummy nodes only have a single incident edge ;
 - 8 **return** G ;
-

6 Experiments

To test the practical application of the algorithms presented in this paper, we have decided to implement them using Python.

Test data. To test the performance of the algorithms in terms of execution time and in terms of edge crossing count after minimization, “random” bipartite graphs of various dimensions were generated. We have outlined the graph generation process in Algorithm 1.

Algorithms. We tested a set of 6 algorithms for one-sided crossing minimization with gap constraints. These include the following:

median sidegaps Algorithm of Theorem 3.2 applied to the median heuristic [3].

barycenter sidegaps Algorithm of Theorem 3.2 applied to the barycenter heuristic [10].

ilp sidegaps Algorithm of Theorem 3.2 applied to an exact ILP formulation from [5].

median kgaps Algorithm of Theorem 4.2 applied to the median heuristic [3].


barycenter kgaps Algorithm of Theorem 4.2 applied to the barycenter heuristic [10].

ilp kgaps The ILP formulation from Section 5.1 for OSCM- k G.

All ILP formulations were implemented in Gurobi, while transitivity constraints Equation (3) were implemented as “lazy constraints ” that will be introduced by Gurobi using branch and cut.

Setup. Each experiment was executed with 20 random graph instances, with parameters set to the following values (unless varied): 40 nodes per layer, a dummy node fraction of 0.2, an average node degree of 3, using the median heuristic. We set a time out of 5 minutes, however, no timeouts were recorded.

The tests were executed on a compute cluster with “Intel Xeon E5-2640 v4” processors running Ubuntu 18.04.6. The Python version used is 3.12.4. The integer linear programs were written using the Gurobi python API and solved by a local instance of the v11.0.1 Gurobi solver with the thread limit set to 1.




■ **Figure 2** Plots comparing the algorithms for OSCM-SG with algorithms for OSCM- k G with $k = 2$.


Results. For the following plots the x -axis is labeled with the varied parameter, while the other parameters remain fixed. For experiments that include the ILP algorithm, there are four plots, one plotting the varied parameter against runtime, one plotting the varied parameter against the total crossing counts, and the same again but in terms of ratio compared to the optimal ILP solution. That is, the 2-gap heuristics are compared to the 2-gap ILP and the side-gap heuristics are compared to the side-gap ILP. Plots with “time” on the y -axis which include ILP runs have a logarithmic y -axis.

Figure 2 compares results for the side-gaps approach and the k -gaps approach with $k = 2$. Both ILP formulations never time out and show good performance with regard to runtime, at least for our variant of generating random instances. It would be reasonable to expect that 2 arbitrary gaps would result in significantly fewer crossings compared to using only side-gaps; however, the difference is quite small.


Figure 3 compares results for different gap counts for the OSCM- k G problem. As can be seen in Figure 3a, increasing gap count yields diminishing returns. That is, the crossings are drastically reduced when comparing two gaps with one gap. Increasing the gap count more does not increase the number of crossings, even when allowing arbitrary many gaps.




(a) Crossing count.



(b) Crossing ratio.



(c) Time.



(d) Time ratio.

■ **Figure 3** Plots for OSCM- k G with varying gap count k .

7 Conclusion

Further research is required to properly integrate our algorithms into the Sugiyama framework. In particular, adjustments might be required to guarantee few edge crossings over all layers, not just between a pair of layers. One might also investigate larger instances, i.e., with more vertices or higher edge densities. Additionally, case studies could show how few gaps can reduce the amount of clutter in the layered graph drawing.

References

- 1 Alexander Dobler and Jakob Roithinger. Layered graph drawing with few gaps and few crossings, 2025. doi:10.17605/OSF.IO/ZP58M.
- 2 Vida Dujmovic and Sue Whitesides. An efficient fixed parameter tractable algorithm for 1-sided crossing minimization. *Algorithmica*, 40(1):15–31, 2004. doi:10.1007/S00453-004-1093-2.
- 3 Peter Eades and Nicholas C. Wormald. Edge crossings in drawings of bipartite graphs. *Algorithmica*, 11(4):379–403, 1994. doi:10.1007/BF01187020.
- 4 Michael Forster. A fast and simple heuristic for constrained two-level crossing reduction. In János Pach, editor, *Proc. Symposium on Graph Drawing and Network Visualization (GD'04)*, volume 3383 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 206–216. Springer, 2004. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-31843-9_22.
- 5 Michael Jünger and Petra Mutzel. Exact and heuristic algorithms for 2-layer straightline crossing minimization. In Franz-Josef Brandenburg, editor, *Proc. Symposium on Graph Drawing and Network Visualizations (GD'95)*, volume 1027 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 337–348. Springer, 1995. doi:10.1007/BFB0021817.
- 6 Yasuaki Kobayashi and Hisao Tamaki. A faster fixed parameter algorithm for two-layer crossing minimization. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 116(9):547–549, 2016. doi:10.1016/J.IPL.2016.04.012.
- 7 Hiroshi Nagamochi. An improved approximation to the one-sided bilayer drawing. In Giuseppe Liotta, editor, *Proc. Graph Drawing and Network Visualization (GD'03)*, volume 2912 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 406–418. Springer, 2003. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-24595-7_38.
- 8 Martin Nöllenburg and Markus Wallinger. Computing hive plots: A combinatorial framework. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 28(2):101–129, 2024. doi:10.7155/JGAA.V28I2.2990.
- 9 Sergey Pupyrev, Lev Nachmanson, and Michael Kaufmann. Improving layered graph layouts with edge bundling. In Ulrik Brandes and Sabine Cornelsen, editors, *Proc. Graph Drawing and Network Visualization (GD'10)*, volume 6502 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 329–340. Springer, 2010. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-18469-7_30.
- 10 Kozo Sugiyama, Shojiro Tagawa, and Mitsuhiko 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.