

Visualization of Event Graphs for Train Schedules

Johann Hartleb ✉

DB InfraGO AG, Germany

Marie Schmidt ✉ 🏠 

Universität Würzburg, Germany

Samuel Wolf ✉ 🏠 

Universität Würzburg, Germany

Alexander Wolff 🏠 

Universität Würzburg, Germany

Abstract

Software that is used to compute or adjust train schedules is based on so-called *event graphs*. The vertices of such a graph correspond to *events*; each event is associated with a point in time, a location, and a train. A *train line* corresponds to a sequence of events (ordered by time) that are associated with the same train. The event graph has a directed edge from an earlier to a later event if they are consecutive along a train line. Events that occur at the same location do not occur at the same time.

In this paper, we present a way to visualize such graphs, namely *time-space diagrams*. A time-space diagram is a straight-line drawing of the event graph with the additional constraint that all vertices that belong to the same location lie on the same horizontal line and that the x -coordinate of each vertex is given by its point in time. Hence, it remains to determine the y -coordinates of the locations. A good drawing of a time-space diagram supports users (or software developers) when creating (software for computing) train schedules.

To enhance readability, we aim to minimize the number of turns in time-space diagrams. To this end, we establish a connection between this problem and MAXIMUM BETWEENNESS. Then we develop exact reduction rules to reduce the instance size. We also propose a parameterized algorithm and devise a heuristic that we evaluate experimentally on a real-world dataset.


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

Keywords and phrases Graph Drawing, Event Graphs, Parameterized Algorithms, Treewidth, Heuristics

1 Introduction

Train schedules are subject to constant changes due to interferences such as temporary infrastructure malfunctions or congestions due to high traffic volume. As a consequence, train schedules must be adjusted in real-time to remedy the disturbances via rerouting and other means. In recent years, the automation of this process has gained track. DB InfraGO AG, a subsidiary of Deutsche Bahn AG, is developing approaches based on a so-called *event graph* [5] as an underlying structure that encodes the necessary information to (re-)compute a train schedule. An event graph models trains running on specific routes on an infrastructure via events. For the further automation and for real-time human intervention, it is important that the event graph can be easily read by humans. For this purpose, we propose a drawing style and algorithms that aim to produce comprehensible drawings of the event graph.

► **Definition 1** (Event Graph). *An event graph \mathcal{E} is a directed graph. Let $V(\mathcal{E})$ denote the vertex set of \mathcal{E} . Each vertex v of \mathcal{E} , called *event*, is associated with a location $\ell(v)$, a positive integer $\text{train}(v)$, and a point of time $t(v)$ when the event is scheduled. For two different events u and w , if $t(u) = t(w)$, then $\text{train}(u) \neq \text{train}(w)$ and $\ell(u) \neq \ell(w)$. There is an arc*



■ **Figure 1** (a) Two different time-space diagrams of the same event graph \mathcal{E} with locations $\{1, \dots, 6\}$. (b) The location graph of \mathcal{E} ; the colored paths are the train lines, the gray numbers the weights.

(u, w) in \mathcal{E} if (i) $\text{train}(u) = \text{train}(w)$, (ii) $t(u) < t(w)$, and (iii) there is no event v with $\text{train}(v) = \text{train}(u)$ and $t(u) < t(v) < t(w)$.

For a train z , we call the sequence v_1, \dots, v_j of all events with $\text{train}(v_1) = \dots = \text{train}(v_j) = z$ ordered by $t(\cdot)$ the *train line* of train z . We propose to visualize event graphs as follows.

► **Definition 2** (Time-Space Diagram). *Let \mathcal{E} be an event graph, let $Y = |\ell(V(\mathcal{E}))|$, and let $y: \ell(V(\mathcal{E})) \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, Y\}$ be a bijection. The *time-space diagram* induced by y is the straight-line drawing of \mathcal{E} in the plane where event v is mapped to the point $(t(v), y(\ell(v)))$.*

In a time-space diagram (see Figure 1a for two examples), we call $y(p)$ the *level* of location p . Given a drawing Γ of an event graph \mathcal{E} and three consecutive events of a train line in \mathcal{E} with pairwise distinct locations p, q, r , we say that there is a *turn* in Γ if the level of q is smaller/larger than the levels of p and r .¹ Experiments suggest that minimizing a classical graph drawing objective, the number of crossings, often does not yield comprehensible drawings. Instead, minimizing the number of turns in a drawing seems to be a promising objective, as Figure 2 illustrates. Therefore, we consider the following problem.

► **Problem 3.** *Let \mathcal{E} be an event graph. Find a time-space diagram Γ of \mathcal{E} that minimizes the number of turns along the train lines in Γ .*

Note that the numbers of turns in a time-space diagram is determined solely by the function y , which represents an ordering of the locations. Therefore, Problem 3 is closely related to the following problem.

► **Problem 4** (MAXIMUM BETWEENNESS). *Let S be a finite set, and let $R \subseteq S \times S \times S$ be a finite set of ordered triplets called *constraints*. A total order \prec satisfies a constraint $(a, b, c) \in R$ if either $a \prec b \prec c$ or $c \prec b \prec a$ holds. Find a total order that maximizes the number of satisfied constraints.*

Note that there is a one-to-one correspondance between (optimal) solutions of Problems 3 and 4. MAXIMUM BETWEENNESS is NP-hard [9], which implies the NP-hardness of Problem 3. MAXIMUM BETWEENNESS has been studied extensively [4, 10–12]. In particular, it admits

¹ Note that this definition does not consider the case where consecutive events have the same location. It is easy to see, however, that we can normalize the graph such that consecutive events always have different locations without changing the optimal solution of Problem 3.

1/2-approximation algorithms [2, 8], but for any $\varepsilon > 0$ it is NP-hard to compute a $(1/2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation [1]. Note that, due to the different objectives, these (non-) approximability results do not carry over to Problem 3; see Appendix A for details.

When translating to MAXIMUM BETWEENNESS, we lose information about the train lines. However, this information proves to be beneficial for our purposes. In particular, we want to leverage the natural sparseness of train infrastructures. We define two auxiliary graphs that capture the connections between locations in \mathcal{E} , which we use in our algorithms.

► **Definition 5 (Location Graph).** *Let \mathcal{E} be an event graph. The **location graph** \mathcal{L} of \mathcal{E} is an undirected weighted graph whose vertices are the locations of \mathcal{E} . For two locations $p \neq q$, the weight $w(\{p, q\})$ of the edge $\{p, q\}$ in \mathcal{L} corresponds to the number of arcs (u, v) or (v, u) in the event graph \mathcal{E} such that $\ell(u) = p$ and $\ell(v) = q$ and $\text{train}(u) = \text{train}(v)$. If $w(\{p, q\}) = 0$, then p and q are not adjacent in \mathcal{L} .*

See Figure 1b for an example. Note that the train line of a train z in the event graph corresponds to a walk (a not necessarily simple path) in the location graph. Abusing the notation of a train line, we also call this path in the location graph a *train line* of z .


► **Definition 6 (Augmented Location Graph).** *Let \mathcal{E} be an event graph. The **augmented location graph** \mathcal{L}' of \mathcal{E} is a supergraph of the location graph \mathcal{L} of \mathcal{E} containing additional edges $\{\ell(v_{i-1}), \ell(v_{i+1})\}$ for each consecutive triplet (v_{i-1}, v_i, v_{i+1}) of a train line in \mathcal{E} .*

The augmented graph \mathcal{L}' has the crucial property that three consecutive events v_{i-1}, v_i, v_{i+1} of a train line whose locations can cause a potential turn form a triangle in \mathcal{L}' .


2 Exact Algorithms

An exact reduction rule. There are substructures that can be solved easily and independently. Consider the location graph \mathcal{L} of an event graph \mathcal{E} . We call a vertex $p \in V(\mathcal{L})$ a *terminal* if a train starts or ends at p , and we say that a path in \mathcal{L} is a *chain* if each of its vertices has degree exactly 2 in \mathcal{L} and the path cannot be extended without violating this property. If a chain contains no terminals, and trains move through the entire chain without turning back, then there is always a turn-minimal drawing of \mathcal{E} that contains no turn along the chain. This is due to the fact that any turn on the chain can be moved to a non-chain vertex adjacent to one of the chain endpoints.

We now sketch a generalization of this intuition. We call two vertices whose removal disconnects a graph a *separating pair*. Let $\{s, t\}$ be a separating pair of \mathcal{L} , let C be a



■ **Figure 2** Two time-space diagrams of the same event graph. Left: A crossing-minimal drawing with zero crossings (and 71 turns). Right: A turn-minimal drawing with one turn (and five crossings).



■ **Figure 3** A transit component that is part of a larger location graph. Each train is represented by a sequence of arcs of the same color. Some trains share edges. The component is contractible with respect to the set of trains.

connected component of $\mathcal{L} - \{s, t\}$, and let $C' = \mathcal{L}[V(C) \cup \{s, t\}]$. We call C a *transit component* if C does not contain any terminal, and if the trains passing through C' via s also pass through t (before possibly passing through s again).

A transit component C is *contractible* if, for each path associated to a train line in C , we can assign a direction such that the resulting directed graph is acyclic; see in Figure 3.

► **Reduction Rule 1** (Transit Component Contraction). Let \mathcal{E} be an event graph, let \mathcal{L} be its location graph, and let C be a contractible transit component that is separated by $\{s, t\}$. For each train z that traverses C , replace in \mathcal{E} the part of the train line of z between the events that correspond to s and t by the arc (directed according to time) that connects the two events.

► **Theorem 7.** *Let \mathcal{E} be an event graph. If \mathcal{E}' is an event graph that results from applying Reduction Rule 1 to \mathcal{E} , then a turn-optimal drawing of \mathcal{E} and a turn-optimal of \mathcal{E}' have the same number of turns.*

See Appendix B for a proof.

A parameterized algorithm. We use dynamic programming on a nice tree decomposition of the augmented location graph \mathcal{L}' . For a definition of a (nice) tree decomposition, see [3]. Since three consecutive locations of a train line form a triangle in \mathcal{L}' , there must be a bag that contains all three locations. Hence, it suffices to check each bag for potential turns in order to find a drawing with the minimum number of turns. For the full proof, see Appendix C.

► **Theorem 8.** *Let \mathcal{E} be an event graph, and let \mathcal{L}' be its augmented location graph. Computing a turn-optimal time-space diagram of \mathcal{E} is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to the treewidth of \mathcal{L}' .*

3 A Greedy Heuristic Approach

The heuristic tries to minimize the number of turns by iteratively inserting trains into an ordering of locations such that the inserted train does not violate the existing ordering and such that its train line is as monotone as possible. The idea is as follows.

Given an event graph \mathcal{E} and its associated location graph \mathcal{L} with train lines $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$, we sort Z with respect to the total weight of the edges of the train lines in \mathcal{L} , in descending order.

For simplicity, we assume that each train line is a simple path in \mathcal{L} . If this is not the case, we decompose each non-simple train line into multiple simple train lines. We construct a directed auxiliary graph G that is initially empty and to which we iteratively insert the edges of each train line until we obtain a directed version of \mathcal{L} . For a directed graph (or simply a set of arcs) H , let $E(H)$ be the set of undirected edges that correspond to the arcs of H .

Let $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ the index of the current iteration. For each connected component P of $E(z_i) \setminus E(G)$, we do the following. Note that P is adjacent to at most two vertices of G . If P is adjacent to *exactly* two vertices p and q in G , we test whether there is a q - p path in G . If this is the case, we select among the edges of P one that has the smallest weight in \mathcal{L} . We reverse the selected edge. Then we insert the vertices and the directed edges of P into G . (The reversal ensures that G remains acyclic.)

After the last iteration, we compute a topological order π of G and draw the time-space diagram of \mathcal{E} induced by π . See Appendix E for the pseudocode of the heuristic.


4 Experimental Analysis

We test the effectiveness of the reduction rule and of the heuristic on an anonymized and perturbed dataset with 19 instances provided by DB InfraGO AG; see Figure 4 for an overview of the dataset. The result of each experiment is the average value over 25 repetitions of the experiment. We implemented our algorithms in the programming language `Python`. We used `Networkx` [7] to handle most of the graph operations and `Gurobi` [6] to solve the integer linear program. All experiments were conducted on a workstation running Fedora 40 with Kernel 6.10.6 using an Intel-7-8850U CPU with 16GB RAM.


Effectiveness of the reduction rule. Our implementation of Reduction Rule 1 is restricted to exhaustively contract chains. But even with this restriction, the reduction rule proves to be effective on the provided dataset. On average, the number of locations was reduced by 75%, where the best result was a reduction by 89% (instance 50_4) and the worst result was a reduction by 55% (instance 20_3). A full evaluation is shown in Figure 5.

Effectiveness of the heuristic. We compare the results of our heuristic to the corresponding optima, which we obtained using the integer linear program (ILP) described in Appendix D, and to the heuristic EM-algorithm that Filipović, Kartelj, and Matić [4] developed for the MAXIMUM BETWEENNESS problem. We use the implementation of the EM-algorithm of Filipović et al. [4] and their parameter settings. On average, our algorithm yields results that are four times better than those of the EM-algorithm on the original instances. On the reduced instances, our algorithm loses its advantage; there, the two approaches perform comparably on average. However, our approach is significantly faster, as our algorithm takes 0.2s on the slowest instance while the EM-algorithm takes 26.3s. See Figures 6 and 7 for a detailed overview of the effectiveness and runtime, respectively. Note that we show the


6 Visualization of Event Graphs for Train Schedules



■ **Figure 4** Left: Instances with respect to the number of events and the number of locations. Right: The histogram depicts the frequency (y-axis) of the number of trains (x-axis) in the dataset, i.e., there are 5 instances containing 5 trains.



■ **Figure 5** Results of the effectiveness of applying contractions, restricted to contracting chains. The bar diagram shows the number of locations in each instance before and after contraction.



■ **Figure 6** Comparison of the effectiveness between our heuristic (Greedy Train Direction), the EM-algorithm of Filipović et al. [4], and the optimum; on the original and the reduced instances.

runtime of the ILP approach only on the reduced instances since the ILP did not converge on most of the original instances within a time limit of one hour.


5 Conclusion and Future Work

In this work we have introduced the problem of computing turn-minimal time-space diagrams to visualize event graphs. We have established a connection between this problem and MAXIMUM BETWEENNESS, we have presented an FPT-algorithm parameterized by the treewidth of the location graph, and we have proposed a heuristic for solving large instances.

The heuristic produces drawings that are still far from optimal, thus it would be interesting to improve this heuristic or to find a better one. As part of our ongoing research, we have developed a new exact integer linear programming approach that shows promising preliminary results, solving the largest real-world instance in less than a second.

References

- 1 Per Austrin, Rajsekar Manokaran, and Cenny Wenner. On the NP-hardness of approximating ordering-constraint satisfaction problems. *Theory of Computing*, 11(10):257–283, 2015. doi:10.4086/toc.2015.v011a010.
- 2 Benny Chor and Madhu Sudan. A geometric approach to betweenness. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 11(4):511–523, 1998. doi:10.1137/S0895480195296221.
- 3 Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Lukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Daniel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michal Pilipczuk, and Saket Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 1st edition, 2015. doi:10.5555/2815661.
- 4 Vladimir Filipović, Aleksandar Kartelj, and Dragan Matić. An electromagnetism metaheuristic for solving the maximum betweenness problem. *Applied Soft Computing*, 13(2):1303–1313, 2013. doi:10.1016/j.asoc.2012.10.015.
- 5 Rihab Gorsane, Khalil Gorsan Mestiri, Daniel Tapia Martinez, Vincent Coyette, Beyrem Makhoulouf, Gereon Vienken, Minh Tri Truong, Andreas Söhlke, Johann Hartleb, Amine Kerkeni,



■ **Figure 7** Runtime comparison between our heuristic (Greedy Train Direction) and the EM-algorithm of Filipović et al. [4] on the original and the reduced instances.

Irene Sturm, and Michael Küpper. Reinforcement learning based train rescheduling on event graphs. In *26th Int. Conf. Intell. Transport. Syst. (ITSC)*, pages 874–879. IEEE, 2023. doi:10.1109/ITSC57777.2023.10422531.

- 6 Gurobi Optimization, LLC. Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual, 2024. URL: <https://www.gurobi.com>.
- 7 Aric Hagberg, Pieter Swart, and Daniel S Chult. Exploring network structure, dynamics, and function using NetworkX. In *7th Python Sci. Conf.*, pages 11–15. SciPy, 2008. doi:10.25080/TCWV9851.
- 8 Yury Makarychev. Simple linear time approximation algorithm for betweenness. *Operations Research Letters*, 40(6):450–452, 2012. doi:10.1016/j.orl.2012.08.008.
- 9 Jaroslav Opatrny. Total ordering problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 8(1):111–114, 1979. doi:10.1137/0208008.
- 10 Christos H. Papadimitriou and Mihalis Yannakakis. Optimization, approximation, and complexity classes. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 43(3):425–440, 1991. doi:10.1016/0022-0000(91)90023-X.
- 11 Aleksandar Savić. On solving the maximum betweenness problem using genetic algorithms. *Serdica Journal of Computing*, 3(3):299–308, 2009. doi:10.55630/sjc.2009.3.299-308.
- 12 Aleksandar Savić, Jozef Kratica, Marija Milanović, and Djordje Dugošija. A mixed integer linear programming formulation of the maximum betweenness problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 206(3):522–527, 2010. doi:10.1016/j.ejor.2010.02.028.

A Complexity Results for the Turn-Minimization Problem

Even though the NP-hardness result of MAXIMUM BETWEENNESS carries over to Problem 3, we provide a simple and reduction from BETWEENNESS that implies para-NP-hardness for the natural parameter, the number of turns, and inapproximability results of this problem.

BETWEENNESS is the decision version of MAXIMUM BETWEENNESS which asks whether an ordering exists that satisfies *all* constraints which was shown to be NP-hard by Opatrný [9].

Let (S, R) be an instance of the BETWEENNESS problem. We construct an instance for Problem 3 corresponding to (S, R) . Let S be the set of location of the event graph that we want to construct. In order to construct the event graph \mathcal{E} , we consider R in an arbitrary but fixed order, where we let the i -th element in the order be denoted by (a_i, b_i, c_i) . For each triplet $(a_i, b_i, c_i) \in R$, we construct a path Ξ_i in \mathcal{E} which is composed of three events $\Xi_i = \langle v_i^1, v_i^2, v_i^3 \rangle$ such that $\ell(v_i^1) = a_i$, $\ell(v_i^2) = b_i$, $\ell(v_i^3) = c_i$ and $t(v_i^1) < t(v_i^2) < t(v_i^3)$. This path Ξ_i can be considered as a train moving from location a_i to c_i over b_i .

▷ **Claim 9.** Using this transformation, (S, R) has a valid ordering \prec , satisfying all constraints in R if and only if the transformed instance \mathcal{E} can be drawn as a time-space diagram Γ without any turns.

Proof. Let (S, R) be a BETWEENNESS instance with a valid ordering \prec . If arranging the locations of \mathcal{E} on levels from top to bottom according to \prec , for each triplet $(a_i, b_i, c_i) \in R$ it holds that either $a_i \prec b_i \prec c_i$ or $c_i \prec b_i \prec a_i$. By construction each Ξ_i corresponding to a constraint $(a_i, b_i, c_i) \in R$ is a path of events with three consecutive locations a_i, b_i, c_i , thus Ξ_i is either monotonically increasing or decreasing in Γ . Therefore, no turn occurs.

Conversely, assume there is a turn-free drawing Γ of the transformed instance (\mathcal{E}, Y) . Let \prec be the ordering of S implied by the mapping y of Γ .

Now, assume that \prec is violates a constraint in $(a_i, b_i, c_i) \in R$. Thus, b_i is not between a_i and c_i in \prec . Then, in the corresponding path Ξ_i the location b_i is also not between a_i and c_i in the mapping y . Therefore, $y(b_i)$ is the smallest/largest level of the three levels $y(a_i), y(b_i), y(c_i)$, implying a turn in Γ ; a contradiction. ◀

Based on this reduction, we can observe some implications on the complexity of other algorithmic approaches assuming $P \neq NP$. In the reduction, we have shown that we can decide BETWEENNESS by testing whether there are *no* turns on the transformed instance. This immediately eliminates the possibility of an FPT- or XP-algorithm whose only parameter is the number of turns as we would then be able to decide BETWEENNESS in polynomial time.

▶ **Corollary 10.** *Finding a turn-minimal time-space diagram is para-NP-hard when parameterized by the number of turns.*

Unfortunately, approximation algorithms with a multiplicative or constant additive factor are also unlikely for similar reasons. A multiplicative α -approximation algorithm is ruled out by the fact that such an approximation algorithm would have to solve the cases with $0 = 0 \cdot \alpha$ turns optimally.

If there was a β -approximation algorithm for a $\beta \in \text{poly}(|V(\mathcal{E})|)$, we could copy each gadget $\beta + 1$ times. By duplicating the gadgets $\beta + 1$ times, a turn in one gadget causes all other copies of the gadget to have a turn as well. Thus, the number of turns is divisible by $\beta + 1$. If there was an optimal mapping from locations to levels without turns, the additive algorithm would also have to return the optimal value, since the only number in the range

$\{0, \beta\}$ that is divisible by $\beta + 1$ is 0, implying that we could again use this algorithm to decide BETWEENNESS.

► **Corollary 11.** *Assuming $P \neq NP$, there is neither a multiplicative approximation algorithm nor an additive β -approximation algorithm with $\beta \in \text{poly}(n)$ for Problem 3.*

B Transit Component Contractions are Safe

► **Theorem 7.** *Let \mathcal{E} be an event graph. If \mathcal{E}' is an event graph that results from applying Reduction Rule 1 to \mathcal{E} , then a turn-optimal drawing of \mathcal{E} and a turn-optimal of \mathcal{E}' have the same number of turns.*

Proof. Let k be the number of turns in a turn-optimal drawing Γ of an event graph \mathcal{E} and let k' be the number of turns in a turn-optimal drawing Γ' of an event graph \mathcal{E} after Reduction Rule 1 was applied on the contractible transit component C . Further, for the sake of simplicity, assume that any train traversing C only traverses C once. If a train z traverses C multiple times, the same arguments apply for each connected component of the train line of z going through C .

We can transform Γ' into a drawing of \mathcal{E} containing C without increasing the number of turns in the following way: Let (s, t) be the separating pair that separates C with levels $y'(s)$ and $y'(t)$ in Γ' such that, without loss of generality, $y'(s) < y'(t)$. Since C is contractible, C admits an acyclic (topological) ordering of the locations in C such that the train line of every train traversing C is directed from s to t . Let \prec_C be such an ordering and let z be a train traversing C , where $z' = \langle v_1, \dots, v_j \rangle$ is the component of the train line of z that traverses C such that $\ell(v_1) = s$ and $\ell(v_j) = t$. Since \prec_C is a valid acyclic topological ordering, it holds that $\ell(v_i) \prec_C \ell(v_{i+1})$ for each $1 \leq i < j$. Thus, by extending y' so that each vertex p in C is assigned a level $y'(p) \in]y'(s), y'(t)[$, with $p, q \in V(C)$ and $y'(p) < y'(q)$ if and only if $p \prec_C q$, no additional turns are introduced in the transformed drawing. As a result, we obtain a drawing of \mathcal{E} that includes C with the same number of turns as Γ' , implying that $k \leq k'$.

Conversely, we can transform Γ into a drawing with a contracted component C with at most k turns. Again let (s, t) be the separating pair of C with levels $y(s)$ and $y(t)$ in Γ such that $y(s) < y(t)$.

First, assume that for each $p \in V(C)$ it holds that $y(s) < y(p) < y(t)$. Clearly, the contraction of C into a single edge transforms Γ into a drawing of the reduced instance with at most k turns.

Now, assume that there are vertices $p \in V(C)$ whose level is smaller (larger) than s (t) and let $L \subseteq V(C)$ be the set of vertices below s and let $U \subseteq V(C)$ be the set of vertices above t . We only describe how to handle U since L can be done analogously. Let Δ be the number of train lines with at least one vertex in U . We reorder the levels of the vertices in U according to a topological ordering of C restricted to U and move all vertices between $y(t)$ and the largest level $y(p') < y(t)$, $p' \in V(C)$. Each train line with at least one vertex in U corresponds to at least one turn in U , namely a turn at the vertex of a train line with the largest level. Therefore, moving and reordering U removes at least Δ turns. Also, the movement and reordering of U results in at most Δ turns more at t , since the only vertices that were moved are vertices in U . After moving and reordering U and L , we are in the first case and can therefore contract C .

This means that we can transform a turn-optimal drawing Γ of an event graph \mathcal{E} into a drawing with a contracted component C without changing the number of turns, implying that $k' \leq k$. This concludes that Reduction Rule 1 is sound. ◀

C Parameterized Algorithm

We use the standard notation of a (nice) tree decomposition by Cygan et al. [3].

► **Theorem 8.** *Let \mathcal{E} be an event graph, and let \mathcal{L}' be its augmented location graph. Computing a turn-optimal time-space diagram of \mathcal{E} is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to the treewidth of \mathcal{L}' .*

We begin with introducing notation. In the following we refer to the time-space diagram simply as drawing and for the sake of brevity we say “a drawing of \mathcal{L} ” and mean the drawing of \mathcal{E} restricted to the locations contained in \mathcal{L} . For some $t \in V(T)$, we define the subgraph \mathcal{L}'_t of \mathcal{L}' to be the graph induced by the union of bags contained in the subtree of T rooted at t . For instance, the induced graph \mathcal{L}'_r with respect to the subtree rooted at the root node r is precisely \mathcal{L}' .

Further, let π^t be an order of the vertices in the bag X_t . We say that a drawing *respects* π^t if the vertices in X_t are drawn such that for all $p, q \in X_t$ with $p \prec_{\pi^t} q$ vertex p is drawn above vertex q . With $\pi^t_{p \rightarrow i}$ we denote the order π^t which is extended by a vertex p such that p has $\text{rank}(p) = i$ within the extended order $\pi^t_{p \rightarrow i}$ and all other vertices in the order that previously had a rank of at least i now have their rank increased by 1. Lastly, we define $b(p, \pi^t)$ to be the number of turns, where p is one of the three locations (p_{i-1}, p_i, p_{i+1}) of a turn in a drawing of $\mathcal{L}'[X_t]$ respecting π^t . Similarly, we write $b(X_t, \pi^t)$ for the total number of turns occurring in a drawing of $\mathcal{L}'[X_t]$ respecting the order π^t , where all three locations (p_{i-1}, p_i, p_{i+1}) of a turn are contained in X_t . Note that each drawing of $\mathcal{L}'[X_t]$ respecting π^t has the same number of turns since π^t dictates an ordering on every vertex in X_t .

Now, let \mathcal{L}' be a given augmented location graph and let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \{X_t\}_{t \in V(T)})$ be a nice tree decomposition of \mathcal{L}' rooted at $r \in V(T)$. We define $D[t, \pi^t]$ to be the number of turns in a turn-optimal drawing of \mathcal{L}'_t respecting the order π^t . Therefore, $D[r, \pi^r]$ with the unique empty order π^r corresponds to the number of turns of a turn-optimal drawing of \mathcal{E} , since r is the root of T and r is associated with a leaf bag $X_r = \emptyset$.

We show how $D[t, \pi^t]$ can be calculated by the following recursive formulas depending on the node type of t . Based on this recursive formulation, the actual optimal ordering of the locations in \mathcal{E} can be extracted via a straightforward backtracking algorithm.

Leaf node (except root): Since the associated bag X_t of a leaf node t is empty, \mathcal{L}'_t is an empty graph and therefore the minimum number of turns of a turn-optimal drawing of \mathcal{L}'_t is $D[t, \pi^t] = 0$ with an empty ordering π^t .

Introduce node: Let p be the vertex that has been introduced in node t , and let c be the only child of t , then

$$D[t, \pi^t] = D[c, \pi^t|_c] + b(p, \pi^t).$$

Inductively, $D[c, \pi^t|_c]$ corresponds to number of turns of a turn-optimal drawing of \mathcal{L}'_c respecting the order π^t restricted to vertices in X_c . The node t extends the graph \mathcal{L}'_c by the vertex p , introducing edges between p and vertices $N(p) \cap X_t$ that can cause turns including p . These turns are counted by $b(p, \pi^t)$. Since π^t dictates the relative position of every vertex in $N[p]$, a turn-optimal drawing of \mathcal{L}'_t respecting π^t must contain every newly introduced turn.

Note that we count a turn at most once in this setting: First, the vertex p is introduced exactly once in \mathcal{L}'_t by the definition of a nice tree decomposition. Further, by the definition of b , we only count a turn if one location of its consecutive events v_{i-1}, v_i, v_{i+1}

is p . Therefore, during the computation of $D[c, \pi^t]$, the turns involving p have not been counted previously.

Forget node: Let $X_t = X_c \setminus \{p\}$ be the bag of t , where p is the vertex that has been forgotten in node t and where c is the only child of t , then

$$D[t, \pi^t] = \min\{D[c, \pi_{p \rightarrow i}^t] \mid i = 1, \dots, |X_c|\}.$$

At node t , we remove vertex p from the bag X_c , therefore $\mathcal{L}'_t = \mathcal{L}'_c$. The ordering π^t dictates the drawing for $\mathcal{L}'[X_c]$ in a turn-optimal drawing in \mathcal{L}'_t except for p . Thus, the number of turns of a turn-optimal drawing of \mathcal{L}'_t respecting π^t must be a turn-optimal drawing in \mathcal{L}'_c respecting the order π^t , where p is inserted into the order π^t for some $\text{rank}(p) = i$.

Note that every turn involved in a turn-optimal drawing respecting $\pi_{p \rightarrow i}^t$ for an optimal i is accounted for precisely once since p only be can forgotten once. Since p was forgotten, X_t is a separating set that separates p from every other vertex in $\mathcal{L}' \setminus \mathcal{L}'_t$, implying that the neighbourhood of p was already processed in \mathcal{L}'_c . Further, since the locations of every possible turn are a triangle in \mathcal{L}' , we know that there is an already processed bag that contains all three locations of consecutive events v_{i-1}, v_i, v_{i+1} that can cause a turn.

Join node: Let i and j be the two children of node t , then we can calculate the number of turns in a drawing of G_t respecting π^t by

$$D[t, \pi^t] = D[i, \pi^t] + D[j, \pi^t] - b(X_t, \pi^t).$$

At a join node, two independent connected components of T are joined, where \mathcal{L}'_i and \mathcal{L}'_j only have vertices X_t in common. By induction, $D[i, \pi^t]$ and $D[j, \pi^t]$ contain the number of turns in a turn-optimal drawing in \mathcal{L}'_i and a turn-optimal drawing in \mathcal{L}'_j , where both drawings respect π^t . Consequently, by summing the number of turns in both drawings \mathcal{L}'_i and \mathcal{L}'_j , we count turns occurring in X_t twice. Therefore, we need to subtract turns whose three corresponding vertices are contained in X_t . Further, note that no new vertex is introduced in a join node, thus no new turn can occur.

With the description of the recursive formulation of $D[t, \pi^t]$, we have shown that a turn (p_{i-1}, p_i, p_{i+1}) in a turn-optimal drawing is counted at least once in an introduce node of the last introduced vertex p of (p_{i-1}, p_i, p_{i+1}) . We have also argued in the description of the forget node that a turn at p is counted at most once. Therefore, we count every turn exactly once in a drawing calculated by $D[r, \emptyset]$, concluding the correctness of the algorithm.

As for the runtime, note that $b(p, \pi^t)$ can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(|X_t|^2)$ time by annotating every clique $\{p, q, r\}$ in \mathcal{L}' corresponding to a potential turn by the number of distinct consecutive event triplets mapping to locations p, q , and r . Since p is involved in each clique, we can enumerate every clique $\{p, q, r\}$ in $\mathcal{O}(|X_t|^2)$ time and due to the annotation, a clique can be processed in constant time. In order to count the total number of turns $b(X_t, \pi^t)$ in a bag X_t , we need $\mathcal{O}(|X_t|^3)$ time. Assuming the algorithm operates on a nice tree decomposition \mathcal{T} of width $\text{tw}(\mathcal{L}')$, there are $\mathcal{O}(\text{tw}(\mathcal{L}') \cdot n)$ many bags in \mathcal{T} . For a node t in the tree decomposition, we have to guess $\mathcal{O}((\text{tw}(\mathcal{L}') + 1)!)^3$ many orders. If t is a leaf node, it can be processed in constant time. Given an order π^t , we can compute any introduce, forget, or join node in $\mathcal{O}(\text{tw}(\mathcal{L}')^3)$ time, yielding an overall runtime of $\mathcal{O}((\text{tw}(\mathcal{L}') + 1)! \cdot \text{tw}(\mathcal{L}')^4 \cdot n)$.

D A Binary Integer Linear Program via Orderings

We model a total ordering of the locations with binary variables x_{pq} for every pair of locations $p \neq q$ of the given reduced event graph \mathcal{E} . The variable assignment $x_{pq} = 1$ means that

location p is before location q in this total ordering. We require that $x_{qp} = 1 - x_{pq}$ and for each in ordered pair $\{p, r\}$ of locations and location q with $q \neq p, q \neq r$, we add a transitivity constraint of the form $x_{pr} \geq x_{pq} + x_{qr} - 1$ which ensures that if $p \prec q$ and $q \prec r$ in the ordering, then also $p \prec r$ must hold. In the following, let \mathcal{Q} be the set of triplets (p, q, r) for which we add a transitivity constraint.

For each train line of train j , we let T_j be a sequence such that the i -th triplet $(p, q, r)_i$ in T_j corresponds to the locations of the triplet of events (v_{i-1}, v_i, v_{i+1}) in the train line of j . Further, let the set of these sequences T_j be denoted by \mathcal{T} . Each triplet $(p, q, r)_i$ in a sequence T_j corresponds to one possible turn. We count each turn with a binary variable b_{ij} , where $b_{ij} = 1$ means that the events corresponding to the triplet $(p, q, r)_i$ forms a turn. In an ordering, a turn corresponding to $(p, q, r)_i$ occurs, if q is not between p and r . This can be counted with a constraint similar to the transitivity constraint. Thus, we can write the complete binary integer linear program in the following way:

$$\text{minimize } \sum_{T_j \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{t_i \in T_j} b_{ij} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{subject to } \quad x_{qp} = 1 - x_{pq} \quad \forall p, q \in \ell(V), p \neq q \quad (2)$$

$$x_{pr} \geq x_{pq} + x_{qr} - 1 \quad \forall (p, q, r) \in \mathcal{Q} \quad (3)$$

$$b_{ij} \geq x_{qp} + x_{qr} - 1 \quad \forall T_j \in \mathcal{T}, (p, q, r)_i \in T_j \quad (4)$$

$$b_{ij} \geq x_{pq} + x_{rq} - 1 \quad \forall T_j \in \mathcal{T}, (p, q, r)_i \in T_j \quad (5)$$

$$x_{pq} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall p, q \in \ell(V), u \neq v \quad (6)$$

$$b_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall T_j \in \mathcal{T}, t_i \in T_j \quad (7)$$

Speeding up the ILP. We can significantly reduce the runtime of the above ILP using *row generation*. This is an iterative approach that starts with an incomplete ILP formulation; in our case without the transitivity constraints. In each iteration, we do the following. We solve the current ILP, which yields a 0–1 solution x . Based on x , we construct a tournament graph G' that has a vertex for each location of \mathcal{E} and that has an edge from location p to location q if and only if $x_{pq} = 1$. The graph G' is a tournament graph due to constraint 2. A cycle in G' corresponds to a violated constraint that is not yet added in the formulation. We pick k cycles of length 3 and add the corresponding transitivity constraint. Since G' is a tournament graph, it suffices to consider only cycles of length 3. If G' is acyclic, the current solution x is feasible.

E

 Pseudocode of the Heuristic

■ **Algorithm 1** Greedy Train Orientation Algorithm
Input: Location graph \mathcal{L} of an event graph \mathcal{E} with simple train lines
 $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$.
Output: An ordering of locations that yields a time-space diagram with few turns.

```

1 Sort  $Z$  in descending order by weight, where the weight of  $z_i$  is  $\sum_{(p,q) \in z_i} w(\{p, q\})$ .
2  $G \leftarrow (\emptyset, \emptyset)$  // Empty directed auxiliary graph
3 foreach  $z_i \in Z$  do
4     /* Split  $z_i$  into  $p$ - $q$  paths  $P$  such that  $V(P) \cap V(G) \subseteq \{p, q\}$  */
5     foreach  $P \in \text{split}(z_i, G)$  do
6          $G \leftarrow G \cup P$ 
7         if  $\exists$   $q$ - $p$  path in  $G$  then
8             /* Inserting  $P$  into  $G$  would result in a cycle. */
9              $(w_1, w_2) \leftarrow \arg \min\{w(e) \mid e \in P\}$ 
10             $G \leftarrow (G \setminus \{w_1, w_2\}) \cup \{(w_2, w_1)\}$ 
9  $y \leftarrow$  topological order of  $G$ 
10 return drawing of  $\mathcal{E}$  with  $y$ 

```
