


Algorithms for Distance Problems in Continuous Graphs

Sergio Cabello ✉ 

Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia
Institute of Mathematics, Physics and Mechanics, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Delia Garijo ✉ 

University of Seville, Spain

Antonia Kalb ✉ 


Technical University of Dortmund, Germany

Fabian Klute ✉ 

Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Spain

Irene Parada ✉ 

Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Spain

Rodrigo I. Silveira ✉ 

Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Spain

Abstract

We study the problem of computing the diameter and the mean distance of a continuous graph, i.e., a connected graph where all points along the edges, instead of only the vertices, must be taken into account. It is known that for continuous graphs with m edges these values can be computed in roughly $O(m^2)$ time. In this paper, we use geometric techniques to obtain subquadratic time algorithms to compute the diameter and the mean distance of a continuous graph for two well-established classes of sparse graphs. We show that the diameter and the mean distance of a continuous graph of treewidth at most k can be computed in $O(n \log^{O(k)} n)$ time, where n is the number of vertices in the graph. We also show that computing the diameter and mean distance of a continuous planar graph with n vertices and F faces takes $O(nF \log n)$ time.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Design and analysis of algorithms

Keywords and phrases diameter, mean distance, continuous graph, treewidth, planar graph

Funding All Spanish coauthors were partially supported by grant PID2023-150725NB-I00 funded by MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 .

Sergio Cabello: Funded in part by the Slovenian Research and Innovation Agency (P1-0297, N1-0218, N1-0285). Funded in part by the European Union (ERC, KARST, project number 101071836). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Irene Parada: I. P. is a Serra Húnter Fellow.

1 Introduction

Graph parameters dealing with distances provide fundamental information on the graph. The *diameter*, defined as the maximum distance between any two vertices of a graph, and the *mean distance*, which gives the average of all those distances, are natural concepts of great importance in real-world applications. While the diameter gives the maximum eccentricity in the graph, the mean distance provides a measure of its compactness, and is closely related

to the *sum of the pairwise distances* of the graph and the well-known *Wiener index*.¹

Computing the diameter and the sum of the pairwise distances of a given graph G is a central problem in algorithmic graph theory. A straightforward algorithm is to perform Dijkstra’s algorithm from each vertex, allowing to compute both parameters in $O(nm + n^2 \log n)$ time, for n and m the number of vertices and edges of G , respectively. Given the high computational cost of this approach, considerable effort has been invested in developing faster algorithms, especially for sparse graphs. It turns out that the general problem is notably difficult. In 2013, it was showed that in sparse graphs, no $O(n^{2-\varepsilon})$ -time algorithm can distinguish between diameter 2 and 3, unless the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis fails [34]. From the proof, one can deduce the same conditional lower bound for computing the sum of the pairwise distances of the graph (see also [9]). This justifies the vast amount of ongoing research on identifying classes of sparse graphs for which these parameters can actually be computed in subquadratic time. Currently, such classes include graphs of bounded treewidth [1, 8, 12], graphs of bounded distance VC dimension [19], median graphs [5], and planar graphs [9, 25].

In this work, we tackle the challenge of subquadratic diameter and mean distance computation for *continuous graphs* (these objects are also called *metric graphs* in other areas closer to analysis [22, 32]). Our main motivation arises from *geometric graphs*. A geometric graph is an undirected graph where each vertex is a two-dimensional point, and each edge is a straight line segment between the corresponding two points. These graphs naturally arise in applications involving geographic information, such as road or river networks. The main characteristic of geometric graphs is that every point on each edge is considered part of the graph. Therefore, the graph can be considered an infinite point set. The diameter of a geometric graph is the maximum distance taken over its infinitely many pairs of points. The class of continuous graphs is actually more general than geometric graphs, and is formally defined in Section 2. Distances in continuous graphs, especially the diameter, have received a lot of interest recently, mainly in the context of augmentation problems [3, 13–16, 23, 24, 27, 28]; see also [4] for results on the mean distance in the context of geometric analysis.

The diameter and the mean distance of a continuous graph with m edges can be computed in roughly $O(m^2)$ time [13, 16, 24]². For the diameter, this follows from the fact that, in a continuous graph, any pair of points attaining the diameter, called *diametral pair*, consists of either: (i) two vertices, (ii) two points on distinct non-pendant edges,³ or (iii) a pendant vertex and a point on a non-pendant edge [13, Lemma 6] (see Figure 1). Regarding the mean distance, one can show that it is given by a weighted sum of the mean distances of all ordered pairs of edges, which can be obtained in constant time, once the distance matrix of the vertices of the graph has been computed [24].

However, for sparse graphs, one hits again a quadratic running time barrier. Algorithms for diameter in discrete graphs do not carry over to continuous graphs, except in few situations (e.g., if there are only $O(1)$ different edge weights, then $O(1)$ Steiner points can be added to each edge, so that the diameter coincides with that of the continuous graph), and the same conditional lower bound of the discrete setting holds for the continuous case (one can reduce the continuous case to the discrete case by simply adding enough long paths to the graph.)

The main challenge for continuous graphs is that the techniques that have successfully

¹ The sum of the pairwise distances of a graph is the sum of distances between all ordered pairs of vertices, and half of this value is the Wiener index. This topological index has been studied extensively.

² The algorithm to compute the diameter in [13] is for plane geometric graphs, but it also applies here.

³ An edge $uv \in E(G)$ is *pendant* if either u or v is a *pendant vertex* (i.e., has degree 1).



■ **Figure 1** Types of diametral pairs of a continuous graph.

worked to speed-up the computation of the diameter and the sum of the pairwise distances for discrete graphs do not seem to easily extend. The most similar setting to ours is perhaps that of planar graphs, for which recently the first subquadratic algorithms were discovered [9, 25]. These works use Voronoi diagrams in planar graphs to compute those values in the discrete setting. However, it is not clear whether they can be adapted to the continuous setting. More precisely, for a fixed source vertex and a fixed subgraph H of a graph G , they compute the Voronoi diagram of H using some additive weights. As the source moves, the additive weights defining the Voronoi diagram change, and the Voronoi diagrams change. Tracing those changes efficiently seems difficult, especially because the combinatorial structure of the Voronoi diagram may undergo important changes. Moreover, such changes can happen for several different movements of the sources. Thus, to achieve a subquadratic algorithm for planar continuous graphs, it seems that one should be able to treat those parallel changes in groups. The current technology for planar graphs does not seem ready for this.

Contributions. In this work, we present subquadratic algorithms to compute the diameter and the mean distance for two classes of sparse continuous graphs. We study continuous graphs of bounded treewidth and show how to compute, respectively, its diameter and its mean distance in subquadratic time. In fact, we consider the slightly more general framework of computing the diameter $\text{diam}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ and the mean distance $\text{mean}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ of a subgraph \mathcal{H} of a continuous graph \mathcal{G} with respect to \mathcal{G} , which are the diameter and mean distance of \mathcal{G} when $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G}$. Theorems 1 and 2 below distinguish whether the treewidth is assumed to be constant, as done in [12], or a parameter, as done in [8].

► **Theorem 1** (Theorems 12 and 17). *Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer constant. Let G be a graph with n vertices, treewidth at most k , nonnegative edge-lengths, and let \mathcal{G} be the corresponding continuous graph. Let H be a subgraph of G and let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be the corresponding continuous subgraph. We can compute the diameter $\text{diam}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ and the mean distance $\text{mean}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ in $O(n \log^{4k-2} n)$ time.*

► **Theorem 2** (Theorems 13 and 18). *Let G be a graph with n vertices, treewidth at most k , nonnegative edge-lengths, and let \mathcal{G} be the corresponding continuous graph. Let H be a subgraph of G and let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be the corresponding continuous subgraph. We can compute the diameter $\text{diam}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ and mean distance $\text{mean}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ in $n^{1+\varepsilon} 2^{O(k)}$ time, for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Similarly to previous algorithms in the discrete setting to compute the diameter and the sum of the pairwise distances for graphs of bounded treewidth [1, 8, 12], the key technique that we use is orthogonal range searching; see also [18] for a novel application of this technique to compute the eccentricity and the distance-sum of any vertex of a directed weighted graph.

Finally, we investigate planar graphs. For any n -vertex continuous plane graph, we show how to compute the maximum eccentricity (i.e., largest distance from a point) over all points on the boundary of a face in $O(n \log n)$ time. Further, we show that the same approach can be used to compute the mean from all points of a face with respect to the continuous graph in $O(n \log n)$ time. This allows us to compute the diameter and mean of continuous

planar graphs in $O(nF \log n)$ time, where F is the number of faces, which is subquadratic, if $F = o(\frac{n}{\log n})$. (By Euler's formula, F is the same for any embedding of a planar graph.)

► **Theorem 3.** *For a continuous planar graph \mathcal{G} with n vertices and F faces, we can compute its diameter $\text{diam}(\mathcal{G})$ and its mean distance $\text{mean}(\mathcal{G})$ in $O(nF \log n)$ time.*

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Continuous graphs

Consider an edge-weighted, connected graph $G = (V(G), E(G), \ell)$, where ℓ is a function that assigns a length $\ell(e) \geq 0$ to each edge $e \in E(G)$ (clearly, for our purposes we assume that not all edge lengths are 0). Informally, the *continuous graph* \mathcal{G} defined by G is the infinite set of points determined by the vertices and edges of G , where each point on an edge is part of the graph. This idea requires to define precisely what we mean by a point on an edge.

For each edge uv of G , we take a closed segment of length $\ell(uv)$ with the usual metric and measure, and denote it $\mathcal{G}(uv)$. Moreover, for such an edge uv , we arbitrarily select one extreme of the segment $\mathcal{G}(uv)$ and denote it $\text{endp}(uv, u)$, and call $\text{endp}(uv, v)$ the other endpoint of $\mathcal{G}(uv)$. Finally, for each vertex u of G , we glue (mathematically, we identify) all points $\text{endp}(uv, u)$ over all edges uv of G incident to u ; we denote by $\mathcal{G}(u)$ the identified point. The continuous graph \mathcal{G} defined by $G = (V(G), E(G), \ell)$ is the resulting space. The total length $\ell(\mathcal{G})$ of a continuous graph \mathcal{G} defined by a graph G is defined as $\sum_{uv \in E(G)} \ell(uv)$.

We observe that one may think of \mathcal{G} as a 1-dimensional simplicial complex where each edge uv is isometric to a segment of length $\ell(uv)$.

A point p of \mathcal{G} can be specified by a triple $(uv, u, \lambda) \in E(G) \times V(G) \times [0, \ell(uv)]$, which represents the point of the segment $\mathcal{G}(uv)$ at distance λ (along $\mathcal{G}(uv)$) from the endpoint $\text{endp}(uv, u)$. The triples (uv, u, λ) and $(uv, v, \ell(uv) - \lambda)$ define the same point of \mathcal{G} . Similarly, for any two incident edges uv, uv' of G , the triples $(uv, u, 0)$, $(uv, v, \lambda(uv))$, $(uv', u, 0)$ and $(uv', v', \lambda(uv'))$ define the same point, namely $\mathcal{G}(u)$.

We have already set the notation $\mathcal{G}(uv)$ for an edge uv and $\mathcal{G}(u)$ for a vertex u . With a slight abuse of notation, we do not distinguish uv from $\mathcal{G}(uv)$ and u from $\mathcal{G}(u)$.

In general, for any subgraph H of G , we denote by $\mathcal{G}(H)$ the continuous subgraph of \mathcal{G} defined by the objects of H . This is also the continuous graph defined by H . Also, when H is clear from the context, we denote such an object \mathcal{H} and talk about \mathcal{H} as a subgraph of \mathcal{G} . For a vertex set $A \subseteq V(G)$, we use $G[A]$ to denote the subgraph of G induced by A .

A *walk* is a sequence of vertices and edges where each edge connects two consecutive vertices. If the first and last vertex coincide, it is *closed*. The length of a walk is the sum of the length of its pieces, counted with multiplicity. For any two points $p, q \in \mathcal{G}$, the distance $d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q)$ is the minimum length over all p -to- q walks. A *shortest pq -path* is a p -to- q walk $\pi(p, q)$ in \mathcal{G} such that $\ell(\pi(p, q)) = d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q)$. We can regard $d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q)$ as the discrete graph-theoretic distance in a graph obtained by subdividing aa' with p as a new vertex, subdividing bb' with p' as a new vertex, and setting $\ell(ap) = \lambda$, $\ell(pa') = \ell(aa') - \lambda$, $\ell(bp') = \lambda'$, and $\ell(p'b') = \ell(bb') - \lambda'$.

2.2 Distance problems

Consider a continuous graph \mathcal{G} defined by a graph G and a continuous subgraph $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ defined by a subgraph $H \subseteq G$. We are interested in distances between points of \mathcal{H} using the metric given by \mathcal{G} . One may think of \mathcal{G} as the ambient space and of \mathcal{H} as the relevant subset.

The *eccentricity* of a point $p \in \mathcal{H}$ with respect to \mathcal{H} is $\text{ecc}(p, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}) = \max_{q \in \mathcal{H}} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q)$; when $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G}$, we just talk about the eccentricity of p in \mathcal{G} and write $\text{ecc}(p, \mathcal{G})$ for $\text{ecc}(p, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$. The *diameter* of \mathcal{H} with respect to \mathcal{G} is defined as $\text{diam}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}) = \max_{p, q \in \mathcal{H}} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q)$; when $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G}$, we just talk about the diameter of \mathcal{G} and write $\text{diam}(\mathcal{G})$ for $\text{diam}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G})$. It is easy to see that $\text{diam}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}) = \max_{p \in \mathcal{H}} \text{ecc}(p, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$. The *sum of distances* of \mathcal{H} in \mathcal{G} is the sum of the pairwise distances in \mathcal{H} , using the metric from \mathcal{G} , that is, $\text{sumdist}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}) = \iint_{p, q \in \mathcal{H}} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q) dp dq$. The *mean distance* of \mathcal{H} in \mathcal{G} is $\text{mean}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}) = \frac{1}{\ell(\mathcal{H})^2} \text{sumdist}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$. It is easy to see that $\text{mean}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}) = \frac{1}{\ell(\mathcal{H})} \int_{p \in \mathcal{H}} \text{mean}(p, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}) dp$, where $\text{mean}(p, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}) = \frac{1}{\ell(\mathcal{H})} \int_{q \in \mathcal{H}} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q) dq$ is the mean distance from the point $p \in \mathcal{H}$ with respect to \mathcal{H} in \mathcal{G} . When $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G}$, then we just write $\text{mean}(\mathcal{G})$ for $\text{mean}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G})$ and $\text{mean}(p, \mathcal{G})$ for $\text{mean}(p, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G})$.

2.3 Treewidth

The *treewidth* of a graph is an important parameter in algorithmic graph theory which, roughly speaking, measures how far the graph is from being a tree. Graphs of treewidth k have $O(kn)$ edges [6]. To define treewidth, we need to first define tree decompositions.

A *tree decomposition* of a graph G is a pair (X, T) where $X = \{X_i \subseteq V(G) \mid i \in I\}$ is a collection of subsets of $V(G)$, and T is a tree with vertex-set I such that:

- (i) $V(G) = \cup_{i \in I} X_i$;
- (ii) for every edge $uv \in E(G)$ there is some X_i such that $u, v \in X_i$;
- (iii) for all $u \in V(G)$, the set of vertices $\{i \in I \mid u \in X_i\}$ induces a connected subtree of T .

The *width* of a tree decomposition is $\max_{i \in I} |X_i| - 1$, and the *treewidth* of G is the minimum width among all tree decompositions of G .

Moreover, graphs with bounded treewidth have a separator that can be found in linear time. This is stated in the following lemma using the concept of *portals*: given a graph G , the portals of a subset $A \subseteq V(G)$ are the vertices of A that have some edge incident to $V(G) \setminus A$.

► **Lemma 4** (Cabello and Knauer [12]). *Let $k > 1$ be a constant. Given a graph G with $n > k + 1$ vertices and treewidth at most k , we can find in linear time a separation (A, B, S) in G such that:*

- (i) A has between $\frac{n}{k+1}$ and $\frac{nk}{k+1}$ vertices;
- (ii) S has at most k portals;
- (iii) adding edges between the portals S does not change the treewidth of G .

Informally, we are interested in separations where A and B have a constant fraction of the vertices and S is small. Such separations of at most k portals and can be computed efficiently [8, 12]. For simplicity, we assume that S contains exactly k portals (it may happen that it has fewer). We use the notation $[k] = \{1, \dots, k\}$.

Throughout this work we will consider two different settings, depending on whether we consider the treewidth a constant or a parameter.

2.4 Orthogonal range searching

We use the notation $B(n, d) = \binom{d + \lceil \log n \rceil}{d}$ to bound the performance of some of our data structures. First we note the following asymptotic bounds.

► **Lemma 5** (Bringmann, Husfeldt, and Magnusson [8]). *$B(n, d) = O(\log^d n)$ and $B(n, d) = n^{\varepsilon} 2^{O(d)}$ for each $\varepsilon > 0$.*

A *rectangle* in \mathbb{R}^d is the Cartesian product of d intervals (whose extremes can be included or not). The analysis of orthogonal range searching performed in [8, Section 3] (see also [33]) leads to the data structure described in the the following theorem. We use the version suggested by Cabello [10] because it adapts better to our needs. (We use \sqcup to indicate that the union is between pairwise disjoint sets.)

► **Theorem 6** (Cabello [10]). *Given a set P of n points in \mathbb{R}^d , there is a family of sets $\mathcal{P} = \{P_j \mid j \in J\}$ and a data structure with the following properties:*

- $P_j \subseteq P$ for each $P_j \in \mathcal{P}$;
- all the sets of \mathcal{P} together have $O(nd \cdot B(n, d))$ points, i.e., $\sum_{P_j \in \mathcal{P}} |P_j| = O(nd \cdot B(n, d))$;
- for each query rectangle $R \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the data structure finds in $O(2^d B(n, d))$ time indices $J_R \subset J$ such that $|J_R| = O(2^d B(n, d))$ and $P \cap R = \sqcup_{j \in J_R} P_j$;
- the family \mathcal{P} and the data structure can be computed in $O(nd \cdot B(n, d))$ time.

3 Diameter in graphs with bounded treewidth

In this section, we discuss the computation of the diameter of a continuous graph with treewidth k . Note that computing the diameter of continuous trees (i.e., treewidth 1) can be reduced to the discrete setting, because in trees the diameter is always attained by two vertices. Thus, we restrict our attention to $k > 1$. As in [1, 8, 9, 12], we use orthogonal range searching to work with distance-related problems in graphs of bounded treewidth. However, because we consider continuous graphs, we have to consider pairs of edges instead of pairs of vertices, and the interaction between edges is more complex. We handle this by using more dimensions in the range searching space.

Sometimes we need to consider an orientation for each edge of G , to distinguish its vertices. We orient the edges of G arbitrarily, but keep track of the orientation. We use uv when the orientation is not relevant and (u, v) or (v, u) , depending on the orientation, when we consider it oriented. We use $E(G)$ in both cases.


3.1 Characterization of the diameter via walks

e start with a characterization of the diameter in the continuous setting that uses the length of walks (compare to Figure 1). For each $aa', bb' \in E(G)$, let $W(aa', bb')$ be a shortest closed walk passing through all the interior points of aa' and bb' .

► **Lemma 7.** *For each $aa', bb' \in E(G)$, $\max_{p \in aa', q \in bb'} d_G(p, q) = \frac{\ell(W(aa', bb'))}{2}$.*

Proof. Let $p \in aa'$ and $q \in bb'$ be two points such that $d_G(p, q) = \max_{p' \in aa', q' \in bb'} d_G(p', q')$. Let $P = au_1 \dots u_k b$ be a shortest ab -path. Consider Figure 2. Exchanging the roles of a and a' , if needed, and the roles of b and b' , if needed, we assume without loss of generality that $\ell(pa) + \ell(P) + \ell(bq) = d_G(p, q)$. This also covers the cases where p or q are vertices. Let $P' = a'u_1 \dots u'_k b'$ be a shortest $a'b'$ -path. If $\ell(pa') + \ell(P') + \ell(b'q) < d_G(p, q)$, then there is a pq -path shorter than $d_G(p, q)$, which is not possible. If $\ell(pa') + \ell(P') + \ell(b'q) > d_G(p, q)$, then there is a pair $p' \in aa'$ and $q' \in bb'$ with $d_G(p', q') > d_G(p, q)$. This contradicts that $d_G(p, q)$ is the maximal distance of all pairs with one point in the interior of aa' and one in the interior of bb' . Therefore, it holds

$$\ell(pa') + \ell(P') + \ell(b'q) = d_G(p, q) = \ell(pa) + \ell(P) + \ell(bq).$$



■ **Figure 2** Visualization of the setting in the proof of Lemma 7. Left: Combining a shortest ab -path, a shortest $a'b'$ -path and the edges aa' and bb' is a shortest closed walk passing through all the interior points of aa' and bb' . Right: To take maximum in Lemma 7 is necessary (the distance between two points is not given, in general, by half the length of a closed walk.)

The sequence $pa, au_1 \dots u_k b, bq, qb', b'u'_k, \dots u'_1 a', a'p$ defines a shortest closed walk W' passing through all the interior points of aa' and bb' and has length $2d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q)$. Therefore,

$$d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q) = \frac{\ell(W')}{2} \leq \frac{\ell(W(aa', bb'))}{2},$$

because $W(aa', bb')$ is a shortest closed walk passing through all the points in the interior of aa' and bb' . On the other hand, any closest walk passing through p and q has length at least $2d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q)$, and therefore $\ell(W(aa', bb')) \leq 2d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q)$. ◀

The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Lemma 7.

► **Corollary 8.** *If $H \subseteq G$ defines the continuous subgraph \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{G} , then $\text{diam}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \max\{\ell(W(aa', bb')) \mid aa', bb' \in E(H)\}$.*

For our computation, we use the following closed formula.

► **Lemma 9.** *For each $aa', bb' \in E(G)$, it holds that*

$$\ell(W(aa', bb')) = \ell(aa') + \ell(bb') + \min\{d_G(a, b) + d_G(a', b'), d_G(a, b') + d_G(a', b)\}.$$

Proof. Set $R_1 = \ell(aa') + d_G(a', b') + \ell(b'b) + d_G(b, a)$ and $R_2 = \ell(aa') + d_G(a', b) + \ell(bb') + d_G(b', a)$. Both quantities are the length of some closed walk passing through the interior of aa' and bb' . Therefore $\ell(W(aa', bb')) \leq \min\{R_1, R_2\}$.

Consider now the optimal walk $W(aa', bb')$ and orient it such that we go along aa' from a to a' . In this direction, we may walk bb' from b to b' or in the opposite direction. In the first case the length of $W(aa', bb')$ is at least R_2 , while in the second case the length is at least R_1 . In either case, we have $\ell(W(aa', bb')) \geq \min\{R_1, R_2\}$. ◀

For each pair of oriented edges $(a_0, a_1), (b_0, b_1) \in E(G)$, Lemma 9 implies that there are two possible values for $\ell(W(a_0a_1, b_0b_1))$. We say that (a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1) is of *type 1* if

$$\ell(W(a_0a_1, b_0b_1)) = \ell(a_0a_1) + \ell(b_0b_1) + d_G(a_0, b_0) + d_G(a_1, b_1),$$

and of *type 2* otherwise. For each oriented edge $(b_0, b_1) \in E(G)$ and type $\tau \in \{1, 2\}$, we define

$$\text{Type}_{\tau}(b_0, b_1) = \{(a_0, a_1) \in E(G) \mid (a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1) \text{ is of type } \tau\}.$$

Therefore, $(a_0, a_1) \in \text{Type}_1(b_0, b_1) \iff d_G(a_0, b_0) + d_G(a_1, b_1) \leq d_G(a_0, b_1) + d_G(a_1, b_0)$.

3.2 Diameter across the portals

Let (A, B, S) be a separation in G with k portals. We fix an enumeration s_1, \dots, s_k of them. Let $E_A \subseteq E(G[A])$ be the edge sets of the subgraph of G induced by A and $E_B \subseteq E(G[B])$, respectively; not necessarily disjoint. For each index $i \in [k]$, each vertex $a \in A$, and each vertex $b \in B$, let $\varphi(i; a, b)$ be the logic predicate that holds whenever s_i is the first portal in the enumeration that lies in some shortest path from a to b . Formally,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(i; a, b) = & \bigwedge_{j < i} [d_G(a, b) < d_G(a, s_j) + d_G(s_j, b)] \wedge [d_G(a, b) = d_G(a, s_i) + d_G(s_i, b)] \wedge \\ & \bigwedge_{j > i} [d_G(a, b) \leq d_G(a, s_j) + d_G(s_j, b)]. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that, for each $(a, b) \in A \times B$, there exists a unique index $i \in [k]$ where $\varphi(i; a, b)$ holds (in other words, $|\{i \in [k] \mid \varphi(i; a, b)\}| = 1$).

We extend this to the four shortest paths defined by two vertices $a_0, a_1 \in A$ and two vertices $b_0, b_1 \in B$, by defining the following predicate for all $\kappa = (i_{0,0}, i_{0,1}, i_{1,0}, i_{1,1}) \in [k]^4$:

$$\Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1) = \Phi((i_{0,0}, i_{0,1}, i_{1,0}, i_{1,1}); a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1) = \bigwedge_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \{0,1\}^2} \varphi(i_{\alpha, \beta}; a_\alpha, b_\beta).$$

Therefore, this predicate holds if and only if, for each $\alpha, \beta \in \{0, 1\}$, the index $i_{\alpha, \beta}$ is the smallest index i with the property that s_i lies on some shortest path from a_α to b_β . As before, for each $(a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1) \in A^2 \times B^2$, there exists a unique 4-tuple $\kappa \in [k]^4$ where $\Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)$ holds. For each $\kappa \in [k]^4$, each $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$, and each type τ we define

$$\Lambda_\tau(\kappa; b_0, b_1) = \max\{\ell(W(a_0 a_1, b_0 b_1)) \mid (a_0, a_1) \in E_A \cap \text{Type}_\tau(b_0, b_1) \wedge \Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)\}.$$

This represents the maximum length over all edges (a_0, a_1) of a type- τ walk between (b_0, b_1) and (a_0, a_1) , consistent with the portals in κ . We next discuss how to compute efficiently $\Lambda_\tau(\kappa; b_0, b_1)$ for several edges $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$ simultaneously.

► **Lemma 10.** *Consider a fixed type $\tau \in \{1, 2\}$ and indices $\kappa \in [k]^4$. In $O(m2^{4k-3}B(m, 4k-3))$ time we can compute the values $\Lambda_\tau(\kappa; b_0, b_1)$ for all $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$.*

Proof. Consider a fixed $\kappa = (i_{0,0}, i_{0,1}, i_{1,0}, i_{1,1}) \in [k]^4$. When possible, we omit from the notation the dependency on κ .

For each vertex $a \in A$ and each $i \in [k]$, we define the point $p(i; a) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ whose j -th coordinate is $p_j(i; a) = d_G(a, s_i) - d_G(a, s_j)$. For each vertex $b \in B$ and each index $i \in [k]$, we define the box $R(i; b) = I_1(i; b) \times \dots \times I_k(i; b) \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, where $I_j(i; b)$ is the interval

$$I_j(i; b) = \begin{cases} (-\infty, d_G(b, s_j) - d_G(b, s_i)) & \text{if } j < i, \\ \mathbb{R} & \text{if } j = i, \\ (-\infty, d_G(b, s_j) - d_G(b, s_i)] & \text{if } j > i. \end{cases}$$

In $p(i; a)$ and $I(i; b)$ we remove the i -th coordinate, as it does not provide any information. We use the same notation for the resulting objects, now in \mathbb{R}^{k-1} . It has been noted [8, 10, 12] that the point $p(i; a)$ lies in the rectangle $R(i; b)$ if and only if $\varphi(i; a, b)$ holds.

Now, we do something similar for $\Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)$. For any two vertices $a_0, a_1 \in A$, we define the point $p(a_0, a_1)$ by concatenating the coordinates of $p(i_{0,0}; a_0)$, $p(i_{0,1}; a_0)$, $p(i_{1,0}; a_1)$, and $p(i_{1,1}; a_1)$. Thus, the point $p(a_0, a_1)$ has $4k - 4$ coordinates. Similarly, for any two

vertices $b_0, b_1 \in B$ we make a rectangle $R(b_0, b_1)$ in \mathbb{R}^{4k-4} by taking the Cartesian product of $R(i_{0,0}; b_0)$, $R(i_{0,1}; b_1)$, $R(i_{1,0}; b_0)$, and $R(i_{1,1}; b_1)$. We then note that

$$\begin{aligned} p(a_0, a_1) \in R(b_0, b_1) &\iff \forall \alpha, \beta \in \{0, 1\} : p(i_{\alpha, \beta}; a_\alpha) \in R(i_{\alpha, \beta}; b_\beta) \\ &\iff \forall \alpha, \beta \in \{0, 1\} : \varphi(i_{\alpha, \beta}; a_\alpha, b_\beta) \\ &\iff \Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1). \end{aligned}$$

We construct a shortest-path tree from each portal s_i and store the distance $d_G(v, s_i)$ to each vertex v of G . This preprocessing takes $O(k(m + n \log n))$ time using standard shortest-path algorithms. This running is bounded by $O(m2^{4k-3}B(m, 4k-3))$ because $4k-3 \geq 5$ for $k \geq 2$. After this, any distance from any portal to any vertex can be accessed in constant time. This means that we can compute the $O(k)$ coordinates of $p(a_0, a_1)$ for all $(a_0, a_1) \in E_A$ and the $O(k)$ intervals of the rectangles $R(b_0, b_1)$ for all $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$ in $O(k|E_A| + k|E_B|) = O(mk)$ time.

For each edge $(a_0, a_1) \in E_A$, we append to $p(a_0, a_1)$ an extra coordinate given by

$$p_{\text{extra}}(a_0, a_1) = d_G(a_0, s_{i_{0,0}}) + d_G(a_1, s_{i_{1,1}}) - d_G(a_0, s_{i_{0,1}}) - d_G(a_1, s_{i_{1,0}}).$$

Let $p^+(a_0, a_1)$ be the resulting point in $4k-3$ dimensions. Similarly, we extend the rectangle $R(b_0, b_1)$ by an extra dimension by taking the Cartesian product with the interval

$$I_{\text{extra}}(b_0, b_1) = (-\infty, d_G(s_{i_{0,1}}, b_1) + d_G(s_{i_{1,0}}, b_0) - d_G(s_{i_{0,0}}, b_0) - d_G(s_{i_{1,1}}, b_1)].$$

Let $R^+(b_0, b_1)$ be the resulting rectangle in $4k-3$ dimensions. Computing these points and intervals takes additional $O(m)$ time.

We note that $p^+(a_0, a_1) \in R^+(b_0, b_1)$ if and only if $\Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)$ and $p_{\text{extra}}(a_0, a_1) \in I_{\text{extra}}(b_0, b_1)$ holds. To explain the rationale behind the previous expressions, first note that the property $\Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)$ translates into

$$\forall (\alpha, \beta) \in \{0, 1\}^2 : i_{\alpha, \beta} \text{ is the smallest index } i \text{ such that } s_i \text{ lies in some shortest path from } a_\alpha \text{ to } b_\beta.$$

In turn, the condition $p_{\text{extra}}(a_0, a_1) \in I_{\text{extra}}(b_0, b_1)$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} d_G(a_0, s_{i_{0,0}}) + d_G(s_{i_{0,0}}, b_0) + d_G(a_1, s_{i_{1,1}}) + d_G(s_{i_{1,1}}, b_1) \leq \\ d_G(a_0, s_{i_{0,1}}) + d_G(s_{i_{0,1}}, b_1) + d_G(a_1, s_{i_{1,0}}) + d_G(s_{i_{1,0}}, b_0), \end{aligned}$$

which, under the assumption that $\Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)$ holds, becomes

$$d_G(a_0, b_0) + d_G(a_1, b_1) \leq d_G(a_0, b_1) + d_G(a_1, b_0).$$

This is precisely the condition for (a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1) to be of type 1. We conclude that

$$p^+(a_0, a_1) \in R^+(b_0, b_1) \iff (a_0, a_1) \in \text{Type}_1(b_0, b_1) \text{ and } \Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1).$$

Therefore,

$$\forall (b_0, b_1) \in E_B : \Lambda_\tau(\kappa; b_0, b_1) = \max\{\ell(W(a_0 a_1, b_0 b_1)) \mid p^+(a_0, a_1) \in R^+(b_0, b_1)\}. \quad (1)$$

We use orthogonal range searching to handle the right side of Equation (1), as follows. We collect the set of points $P_A = \{p^+(a_0, a_1) \mid (a_0, a_1) \in E_A\}$. These are $O(|E_A|) = O(m)$ points in \mathbb{R}^{4k-3} . For P_A we compute $\mathcal{P} = \{P_j \mid j \in J\}$ and the data structure of Theorem 6.

This takes $O(|P_A|(4k-3) \cdot B(|E_A|, 4k-3)) = O(mk \cdot B(m, 4k-3))$ time. For each $j \in J$, we compute and store the weight

$$\omega_j = \max\{d_G(a_0, s_{i_{0,0}}) + \ell(a_0 a_1) + d_G(a_1, s_{i_{1,1}}) \mid p^+(a_0, a_1) \in P_j\}.$$

Computing these values ω_j over all $j \in J$ takes $O(\sum_j |P_j|)$ and does not affect the asymptotic running time. This finishes the description of the construction of the data structure.

Consider now an edge $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$. We query the data structure with the rectangle $R = R^+(b_0, b_1)$ and get the indices J_R such that $P_A \cap R^+(b_0, b_1) = \bigsqcup_{j \in J_R} P_j$. The query takes $O(2^{4k-3}B(m, 4k-3))$ time and $|J_R| = O(2^{4k-3}B(m, 4k-3))$. Next, we compute in $O(2^{4k-3}B(m, 4k-3))$ time

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(b_0, b_1) &= \max\{\omega_j \mid j \in J_R\} \\ &= \max\{d_G(s_{i_{0,0}}, a_0) + \ell(a_0 a_1) + d_G(a_1, s_{i_{1,1}}) \mid p^+(a_0, a_1) \in R^+(b_0, b_1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we can compute the value $\Lambda_1(\kappa; b_0, b_1)$ using that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_1(\kappa; b_0, b_1) &= \max\{\ell(W(a_0 a_1, b_0 b_1)) \mid (a_0, a_1) \in \text{Type}_1(b_0, b_1) \wedge \Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)\} \\ &= \max\{\ell(a_0 a_1) + \ell(b_0 b_1) + d_G(a_0, b_0) + d_G(a_1, b_1) \mid \\ &\quad (a_0, a_1) \in \text{Type}_1(b_0, b_1) \wedge \Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)\} \\ &= d_G(s_{i_{0,0}}, b_0) + \ell(b_0 b_1) + d_G(b_1, s_{i_{1,1}}) \\ &\quad + \max\{d_G(s_{i_{0,0}}, a_0) + \ell(a_0 a_1) + d_G(a_1, s_{i_{1,1}}) \mid \\ &\quad (a_0, a_1) \in \text{Type}_1(b_0, b_1) \wedge \Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)\} \\ &= d_G(s_{i_{0,0}}, b_0) + \ell(b_0 b_1) + d_G(b_1, s_{i_{1,1}}) \\ &\quad + \max\{d_G(s_{i_{0,0}}, a_0) + \ell(a_0 a_1) + d_G(a_1, s_{i_{1,1}}) \mid p^+(a_0, a_1) \in R^+(b_0, b_1)\} \\ &= d_G(s_{i_{0,0}}, b_0) + \ell(b_0 b_1) + d_G(b_1, s_{i_{1,1}}) + \omega(b_0, b_1). \end{aligned}$$

This last step takes $O(1)$ time. In total, we spend $O(2^{4k-3}B(m, 4k-3))$ time per edge (b_0, b_1) to compute $\Lambda_1(\kappa; b_0, b_1)$. The computation of $\Lambda_2(\kappa; b_0, b_1)$ is similar. Since the idea is analogous to the one described for $\tau = 1$, we focus on the differences between both types.

We define the interval

$$\tilde{I}_{\text{extra}}(b_0, b_1) = (d_G(s_{i_{0,1}}, b_1) + d_G(s_{i_{1,0}}, b_0) - d_G(s_{i_{0,0}}, b_0) - d_G(s_{i_{1,1}}, b_1), +\infty),$$

and define the rectangle $\tilde{R}^+(b_0, b_1) = R(b_0, b_1) \times \tilde{I}_{\text{extra}}(b_0, b_1)$. (Note that $I_{\text{extra}}(b_0, b_1) \sqcup \tilde{I}_{\text{extra}}(b_0, b_1) = \mathbb{R}$, which is expected because the two types are complementary.)

We then have

$$p^+(a_0, a_1) \in \tilde{R}^+(b_0, b_1) \iff (a_0, a_1) \in \text{Type}_2(b_0, b_1) \text{ and } \Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1).$$

We keep using the same data structure for the set of points P_A . However, for each $j \in J$, we compute another weight, namely

$$\tilde{\omega}_j = \max\{d_G(a_0, s_{i_{0,1}}) + \ell(a_0 a_1) + d_G(a_1, s_{i_{1,0}}) \mid p^+(a_0, a_1) \in P_j\}.$$

When considering the edge $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$, we query the data structure with $\tilde{R} = \tilde{R}^+(b_0, b_1)$ and get a set $J_{\tilde{R}} \subset J$ with $O(2^{4k-3}B(m, 4k-3))$ indices such that $P_A \cap \tilde{R}^+(b_0, b_1) = \bigsqcup_{j \in J_{\tilde{R}}} P_j$. We then compute

$$\tilde{\omega}(b_0, b_1) = \max\{\tilde{\omega}_j \mid j \in J_{\tilde{R}}\}.$$

and note that $\Lambda_2(\kappa; b_0, b_1) = d_G(s_{i_{1,0}}, b_0) + \ell(b_0 b_1) + d_G(b_1, s_{i_{0,1}}) + \tilde{\omega}(b_0, b_1)$. \blacktriangleleft

► **Lemma 11.** *We can compute $\max_{p \in \mathcal{G}(E_A), q \in \mathcal{G}(E_B)} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q)$ in $O(m2^{4k-3}k^4B(m, 4k-3))$ time.*

Proof. We use Lemma 10 to compute for each type $\tau \in \{1, 2\}$ and indices $\kappa \in [k]^4$ the values $\Lambda_{\tau}(\kappa; b_0, b_1)$ for all $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$. This requires applying Lemma 10 a total of $O(k^4)$ times, and therefore we spend $O(m2^{4k-3}k^4B(m, 4k-3))$ time.

Because for each $(a_0, a_1) \in E_A$ and each $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$, there is one $\kappa \in [k]^4$ such that $\Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)$, and because the types complement each other, we have

$$\forall (b_0, b_1) \in E_B : \max_{(a_0, a_1) \in E_A} \ell(W(a_0a_1, b_0b_1)) = \max \{ \Lambda_{\tau}(\kappa; b_0, b_1) \mid \kappa \in [k]^4, \tau \in \{1, 2\} \}.$$

Using Lemma 9, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{p \in \mathcal{G}(E_A), q \in \mathcal{G}(E_B)} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q) &= \max_{(a_0a_1) \in E_A, (b_0b_1) \in E_B} \max_{p \in \mathcal{G}(a_0a_1), q \in \mathcal{G}(b_0b_1)} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q) \\ &= \max_{(a_0a_1) \in E_A, (b_0b_1) \in E_B} \frac{\ell(W(a_0a_1, b_0b_1))}{2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \max_{(b_0, b_1) \in E_B} \max_{(a_0, a_1) \in E_A} \ell(Wa_0a_1, b_0b_1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \max_{(b_0, b_1) \in E_B} \max \{ \Lambda_{\tau}(\kappa; b_0, b_1) \mid \kappa \in [k]^4, \tau \in \{1, 2\} \} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \max \{ \Lambda_{\tau}(\kappa; b_0, b_1) \mid (b_0, b_1) \in E_B, \kappa \in [k]^4, \tau \in \{1, 2\} \}. \end{aligned}$$

With this expression, it is clear we can obtain the result in $O(|E_B| \cdot k^4 \cdot 2)$ additional time. ◀

Remark: We are aware that some log factors can be shaved off, and that for small k one can improve the analysis slightly. However, we prefer to keep this high-level structure to keep it simpler, and parallel to the forthcoming computation of mean distance.

3.3 Global diameter


Let G be a graph with n vertices and m edges defining the continuous graph \mathcal{G} . Let H be a subgraph of G defining a continuous graph $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. We use a divide-and-conquer approach to compute $\text{diam}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$.

Let (A, B, S) be a separation in G . Let G' be the graph obtained from G by adding an edge ss' with length $d_{\mathcal{G}}(s, s')$ for every pair of portals $s, s' \in S$. (If the edge already exists, we redefine its length.) For $X \in \{A, B\}$, let \mathcal{H}_X and \mathcal{G}'_X be the continuous graphs defined by $H[X] - E(G[S])$ and $G'[X]$, respectively. The edges ss' added to G guarantee that $d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q) = d_{\mathcal{G}'_X}(p, q)$ for any points $p, q \in \mathcal{H}_X$. (We removed $E(G[S])$ because for points on edges between portals whose length is redefined, the statement is undefined.) Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{diam}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}) &= \max \left\{ \max_{p, q \in \mathcal{H}_A} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q), \max_{p, q \in \mathcal{H}_B} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q), \max_{p \in \mathcal{H}_A, q \in \mathcal{H}_B} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q) \right\} \\ &= \max \left\{ \max_{p, q \in \mathcal{H}_A} d_{\mathcal{G}'_A}(p, q), \max_{p, q \in \mathcal{H}_B} d_{\mathcal{G}'_B}(p, q), \max_{p \in \mathcal{H}_A, q \in \mathcal{H}_B} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q) \right\} \\ &= \max \left\{ \text{diam}(\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{G}'_A), \text{diam}(\mathcal{H}_B, \mathcal{G}'_B), \max_{p \in \mathcal{H}_A, q \in \mathcal{H}_B} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

(see Figure 3). The last term can be computed by Lemma 11, which depends on the size of S .

Now we have two regimes depending on whether we want to assume that the treewidth is constant, as done in [12], or whether we want to consider the treewidth a parameter, as done in [8]. The same distinction was made in [10]. This difference affects the time to find a tree decomposition and the number of portals in a balanced separation. In both cases we use that an n -vertex graph with treewidth k has $O(kn)$ edges [6].



■ **Figure 3** Visualization of the divide-and-conquer approach to compute $\text{diam}(\mathcal{G})$ (see Equation (2)).

► **Theorem 12.** *Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer constant. Let G be a graph with n vertices, treewidth at most k , nonnegative edge-lengths, and let \mathcal{G} be the corresponding continuous graph. Let H be a subgraph of G and let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be the corresponding continuous subgraph. We can compute the diameter $\text{diam}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ in $O(n \log^{4k-2} n)$ time.*

Proof. If G has fewer than $2k = O(1)$ vertices, we compute $\text{diam}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ in $O(1)$ time. Otherwise, we find in linear time a separation (A, B, S) such that: $|S| \leq k$, $\frac{n}{k+1} \leq |A| \leq \frac{nk}{k+1}$. Such a separation is given, e.g., in [12]. Further, we add an edge ss' between all portals $s, s' \in S$ with length $d_G(s, s')$.

By Lemma 11, the value $\max_{p \in \mathcal{H}_A, q \in \mathcal{H}_B} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q)$ is computed in $O(m2^{4k-3}k^4B(m, 4k-3))$ time. Using that k is constant, $m = O(n)$, and Lemma 5, this time bound is $O(n \log^{4k-3} n)$.

We construct the graphs $G', G'[A], G'[B], H[A] - E(G[S])$ and $H[B] - E(G[S])$ explicitly, in $O(m) = O(n)$ time. Because adding edges between the portals of S does not increase the treewidth, the graphs $G'[A]$ and $G'[B]$ have treewidth at most k . The values $\text{diam}(\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{G}'_A)$ and $\text{diam}(\mathcal{H}_B, \mathcal{G}'_B)$ are computed recursively, and we obtain $\text{diam}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ using Equation (2).

Since $\frac{n}{k+1} \leq |A| \leq \frac{nk}{k+1}$ and k is constant, each side of the recursion has a constant fraction of the vertices $|A| + |B| = n + k$, and the recursion depth is $O(\log n)$, leading to a total running time of $O(n \log^{4k-2} n)$. ◀

► **Theorem 13.** *Let G be a graph with n vertices, treewidth at most k , nonnegative edge-lengths, and let \mathcal{G} be the corresponding continuous graph. Let H be a subgraph of G and let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be the corresponding continuous subgraph. We can compute the diameter $\text{diam}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ in $n^{1+\varepsilon}2^{O(k)}$ time, for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Proof. We use the same divide-and-conquer strategy as in Theorem 12. The difference is in the properties of the separation. If G has $O(k)$ vertices, we compute $\text{diam}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ in $O(k^2)$ time. Otherwise, we proceed as follows.

First, we note that, given a tree decomposition of G of width k' , we can obtain in linear time a separation (A, B, S) in G with the following properties: the set S of portals for A has $k' + 1$ portals; both A and $B = (V(G) \setminus A)$ have $\Theta(n - k)$ vertices each; adding edges between the vertices of S does not increase the treewidth of the tree decomposition. See for example [6, Theorem 19]; the set S is a bag of the decomposition and thus the tree decomposition keeps being valid with the addition of edges within S .

It is shown in [7] that, for graphs of treewidth at most k , one can find a tree decomposition of width $k' = 3k + 4$ in $2^{O(k)}n \log n$ time. From this we obtain the separation (A, B, S) in G mentioned above, where $|S| \leq k' + 1 = 3k + 5$. By Lemma 11, the value $\max_{p \in \mathcal{H}_A, q \in \mathcal{H}_B} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q)$ is computed in $O(m2^{O(k)}(k' + 1)^4B(m, O(k)))$ time. Using that $m = O(kn)$ and the estimate of Lemma 5, this time bound becomes

$$O((kn)2^{O(k)}(k' + 1)^4 \cdot B(n, O(k))) = O(n2^{O(k)} \cdot n^\varepsilon 2^{O(k)}) = n^{1+\varepsilon}2^{O(k)},$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily small.

To compute $\text{diam}(\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{G}'_A)$ and $\text{diam}(\mathcal{H}_B, \mathcal{G}'_B)$ recursively, we pass to the subproblems the tree decomposition we have computed, trimmed to the vertices of A and B , respectively. We also can adapt it to keep the tree decompositions of size $O(|A|)$ and $O(|B|)$, respectively. In this way, at any level of the recursion, we always have a set S with $k' + 1 = 3k + 5$ portals. Thus, we compute the tree decomposition only once, and then pass it to each subproblem trimmed to the relevant vertices. The recursive calls add a logarithmic factor to the total running time, which is absorbed by the polynomial term $n^{1+\varepsilon}$.

(The reason for passing the tree decomposition to the subproblems is that adding the edges between the portals in S may give a clique of size k' , which increases the treewidth of G' . Computing an approximate tree decomposition of G' anew would increase the width of the decomposition at each level. However, if we pass the tree decomposition to the subproblems, we keep the width of the decomposition bounded by $3k + 5$ at all levels of the recursion.) ◀

4 Mean distance in graphs with bounded treewidth

In this section, we discuss the computation of the mean distance in continuous graphs with treewidth k . The case of $k = 1$ corresponds to continuous trees, one of the few graph classes for which linear-time algorithms are known [24]. Thus, we focus on $k > 1$. All our efforts will be on the computation of $\text{sumdist}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$, from which $\text{mean}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ can be easily computed. Again, we use orthogonal range searching, but now we need to efficiently retrieve sums of distances. We achieve this by representing the sum of distances between pairs of edges as volumes of collections of triangular prisms, which can be represented in a compact way.

4.1 Mean distance as a volume

We compute the sum of all distances in a continuous graph as the volume of a collection of triangular prisms. A *truncated triangular prism* is the portion of a triangular prism contained in a closed halfspace containing the whole basis; the heights are the lengths of the three edges orthogonal to the basis. The volume of a truncated triangular prism with base Δ and heights h_1, h_2, h_3 is $\frac{1}{3} \text{area}(\Delta)(h_1 + h_2 + h_3)$.

Consider the following setting defined by a complete graph with vertex set $\{a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1\}$ and variable edge lengths, as follows: (i) a_0a_1 has variable length $y > 0$, (ii) b_0b_1 has variable length $z > 0$, (iii) for all $\alpha, \beta \in \{0, 1\}$, $a_\alpha b_\beta$ has length $x_{\alpha, \beta} \geq 0$.

Let $K = K(y, z, x_{0,0}, x_{0,1}, x_{1,0}, x_{1,1})$ denote this graph, and let \mathcal{K} denote the corresponding continuous graph. See Figure 4. We say that the 6-tuple $(y, z, x_{0,0}, x_{0,1}, x_{1,0}, x_{1,1})$ is *compliant* if, for all $\alpha, \beta \in \{0, 1\}$ it holds $x_{\alpha, \beta} = d_K(a_\alpha, b_\beta)$. In our setting we only need to consider compliant cases. (This poses some conditions on the values that the variables can take.)

We want to understand how the total sum of distances between points on a_0a_1 and b_0b_1 ,

$$\xi(y, z, x_{0,0}, x_{0,1}, x_{1,0}, x_{1,1}) = \iint_{p \in \mathcal{K}(a_0a_1), q \in \mathcal{K}(b_0b_1)} d_{\mathcal{K}}(p, q) dp dq,$$


looks like. For each $\lambda \in [0, y]$, let $p(\lambda)$ be the point specified by the triple (a_0a_1, a_0, λ) , and, for each $\mu \in [0, z]$, let $q(\mu)$ be the point specified by the triple (b_0b_1, b_0, μ) . Then

$$\xi(y, z, x_{0,0}, x_{0,1}, x_{1,0}, x_{1,1}) = \iint_{(\lambda, \mu) \in [0, y] \times [0, z]} d_{\mathcal{K}}(p(\lambda), q(\mu)) d\lambda d\mu.$$

Function $(\lambda, \mu) \mapsto d_{\mathcal{K}}(p(\lambda), q(\mu))$, defined in $[0, y] \times [0, z]$, is the lower envelope of four functions

$$x_{0,0} + \lambda + \mu, \quad x_{0,1} + \lambda + z - \mu, \quad x_{1,0} + y - \lambda + \mu, \quad x_{1,1} + y - \lambda + z - \mu.$$

Following [24], we call that the graph of function $(\lambda, \mu) \mapsto d_{\mathcal{K}}(p(\lambda), q(\mu))$ a *roof*; the value ξ is the volume below the roof. The minimization diagram of this function consists of convex pieces; see Figure 4. The gradient of each function is of the form $(\pm 1, \pm 1)$. When the variable values are compliant, all four functions appear in the lower envelope, and the minimization diagram has four regions. (Some of them may contain only part of an edge of the domain.)



■ **Figure 4** Concrete example of the minimization diagram of $d_{\mathcal{K}}(p(\lambda), q(\mu))$. In the center, some values of $d_{\mathcal{K}}(p(\lambda), q(\mu))$ are shown in red; on the right, 3D visualization of the roofs.

► **Lemma 14.** Consider the 4-variable linear function $L(x_{0,0}, x_{0,1}, x_{1,0}, x_{1,1}) = x_{1,0} + x_{0,1} - x_{0,0} - x_{1,1}$. There are two 6-variable polynomials $\varrho_+(\cdot)$, $\varrho_-(\cdot)$ of degree at most three with the following property: when $(y, z, x_{0,0}, x_{0,1}, x_{1,0}, x_{1,1})$ is compliant,

$$\xi(y, z, x_{0,0}, x_{0,1}, x_{1,0}, x_{1,1}) = \begin{cases} \varrho_+(y, z, x_{0,0}, x_{0,1}, x_{1,0}, x_{1,1}), & \text{if } L(x_{0,0}, x_{0,1}, x_{1,0}, x_{1,1}) \geq 0, \\ \varrho_-(y, z, x_{0,0}, x_{0,1}, x_{1,0}, x_{1,1}), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. For the compliant case, there are two possible roofs, as shown in Figure 5. We conclude that the following values exist

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_0 &\in [0, y] \text{ such that } d_{\mathcal{K}}(a_0, b_0) + \lambda_0 = d_{\mathcal{K}}(a_1, b_0) + (y - \lambda_0), \\ \lambda_1 &\in [0, y] \text{ such that } d_{\mathcal{K}}(a_0, b_1) + \lambda_1 = d_{\mathcal{K}}(a_1, b_1) + (y - \lambda_1), \\ \mu_0 &\in [0, z] \text{ such that } d_{\mathcal{K}}(a_0, b_0) + \mu_0 = d_{\mathcal{K}}(a_0, b_1) + (z - \mu_0), \\ \mu_1 &\in [0, z] \text{ such that } d_{\mathcal{K}}(a_1, b_0) + \mu_1 = d_{\mathcal{K}}(a_1, b_1) + (z - \mu_1). \end{aligned}$$

Since $x_{\alpha, \beta} = d_{\mathcal{K}}(a_{\alpha}, b_{\beta})$, the solution is

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_0 &= \frac{1}{2}(y + x_{1,0} - x_{0,0}), \\ \lambda_1 &= \frac{1}{2}(y + x_{1,1} - x_{0,1}), \\ \mu_0 &= \frac{1}{2}(z + x_{0,1} - x_{0,0}), \\ \mu_1 &= \frac{1}{2}(z + x_{1,1} - x_{1,0}). \end{aligned}$$

To know in which case we are, we compare λ_0 and λ_1 . Thus, it suffices to consider the sign of

$$(y + x_{1,0} - x_{0,0}) - (y + x_{1,1} - x_{0,1}) = x_{1,0} + x_{1,1} - x_{0,0} - x_{0,1} = L(x_{0,0}, x_{0,1}, x_{1,0}, x_{1,1}).$$

Note that $\lambda_0 \geq \lambda_1$ if and only if $\mu_0 \geq \mu_1$.




Figure 5 The cases where $L > 0$ (left), $L = 0$ (center) and $L < 0$ (right).




Figure 6 Breaking the domain into triangles to compute the volume for $L \geq 0$. Left: coordinates in the domain. Right: values $d_{\mathcal{K}}(p(\lambda), q(\mu))$.

When we know how the minimization diagram looks like, we can compute the volume below the roof by breaking the minimization diagram into triangles, as shown in Figure 6. The structure of the decomposition is the same, independently of the actual values of the parameters, as far as $(y, z, x_{0,0}, x_{0,1}, x_{1,0}, x_{1,1})$ is compliant and $L(x_{0,0}, x_{0,1}, x_{1,0}, x_{1,1}) > 0$.

The area of each triangle is a linear function on y, λ_0, λ_1 multiplied by a linear function on z, μ_0, μ_1 . At the vertices of each piece, the value of $d_{\mathcal{K}}(p(\lambda), q(\mu))$ is a linear combination of $x_{0,0}, y, \lambda_0, \lambda_1, z, \mu_0, \mu_1$. We conclude that $\xi(y, z, x_{0,0}, x_{0,1}, x_{1,0}, x_{1,1})$ is the sum of a finite number of cubic polynomials in the variables, and therefore it is itself a cubic polynomial.

Cases $L = 0$ and $L < 0$ are handled similarly (the latter with a different polynomial). ◀

4.2 Integral across the portals

We reuse much of the notation and ideas from Section 3.2. As before, G is a graph with n vertices and m edges, (A, B, S) is a separation in G with exactly k portals, and we fix an enumeration of the portals as s_1, \dots, s_k . We also fix an orientation for the edges of G . Let $E_A \subseteq E(G[A])$ be the edge sets of the subgraph of G induced by A and $E_B \subseteq E(G[B])$, respectively; not necessarily disjoint. Our objective in this section is to compute the sum of distances between points in E_A and E_B :

$$\iint_{p \in \mathcal{G}(E_A), q \in \mathcal{G}(E_B)} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q) dp dq = \sum_{(a_0, a_1) \in E_A} \sum_{(b_0, b_1) \in E_B} \iint_{p \in \mathcal{G}(a_0 a_1), q \in \mathcal{G}(b_0 b_1)} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q) dp dq.$$

Define the graph $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}(\ell(a_0 a_1), \ell(b_0 b_1), d_G(a_0, b_0), d_G(a_0, b_1), d_G(a_1, b_0), d_G(a_1, b_1))$, for two edges $(a_0, a_1) \in E_A, (b_0, b_1) \in E_B$.

The continuous edges $a_0 a_1$ and $b_0 b_1$ belong to \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{K} and, for each $p \in \mathcal{G}(a_0 a_1)$ and

$q \in \mathcal{G}(b_0b_1)$ we have $d_G(p, q) = d_{\mathcal{K}}(p, q)$. It follows that

$$\iint_{p \in \mathcal{G}(a_0a_1), q \in \mathcal{G}(b_0b_1)} d_G(p, q) dp dq = \iint_{p \in \mathcal{K}(a_0a_1), q \in \mathcal{K}(b_0b_1)} d_{\mathcal{K}}(p, q) dp dq.$$

It follows that our objective is to compute

$$\sum_{(a_0, a_1) \in E_A} \sum_{(b_0, b_1) \in E_B} \xi(\ell(a_0a_1), \ell(b_0b_1), d_G(a_0, b_0), d_G(a_0, b_1), d_G(a_1, b_0), d_G(a_1, b_1)).$$

We keep using the predicates $\varphi(i; a, b)$ and $\Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)$ defined in Section 3.2, where $a, a_0, a_1 \in A$, $b, b_0, b_1 \in B$, $i \in [k]$ and $\kappa = (i_{0,0}, i_{0,1}, i_{1,0}, i_{1,1}) \in [k]^4$.

Consider the polynomial L of Lemma 14. For each pair $(a_0, a_1), (b_0, b_1) \in E(G)$, we have

$$(a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1) \text{ of type 1} \iff L(d_G(a_0, b_0), d_G(a_0, b_1), d_G(a_1, b_0), d_G(a_1, b_1)) \geq 0.$$

Otherwise, (a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1) is of *type 2*. For each oriented edge $(b_0, b_1) \in E(G)$ and type $\tau \in \{1, 2\}$, we define

$$\text{Type}_\tau(b_0, b_1) = \{(a_0, a_1) \in E(G) \mid (a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1) \text{ of type } \tau\}. \quad (3)$$

For each $\kappa \in [k]^4$, each $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$, and each type $\tau \in \{1, 2\}$ we define

$$\Psi_\tau(\kappa; b_0, b_1) = \sum \xi(\ell(a_0a_1), \ell(b_0b_1), d_G(a_0, b_0), d_G(a_0, b_1), d_G(a_1, b_0), d_G(a_1, b_1)), \quad (4)$$

where the sum ranges over all oriented edges $(a_0, a_1) \in E_A$ such that $(a_0, a_1) \in \text{Type}_\tau(b_0, b_1)$ and $\Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)$ holds.

Next, we show that we can efficiently compute $\Psi_\tau(\kappa; b_0, b_1)$ for all edges $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$:

► **Lemma 15.** *Consider a fixed type $\tau \in \{1, 2\}$ and indices $\kappa \in [k]^4$. We can compute the values $\Psi_\tau(\kappa; b_0, b_1)$ for all $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$ in $O(m2^{4k-3}B(m, 4k-3))$ time.*

Proof. We discuss the computation of $\tau = 1$; the case $\tau = 2$ is analogous and omitted. By the triangle inequality for distances in graphs, for each $(a_1, a_2) \in E_A$ and each $(b_1, b_2) \in E_B$, the tuple $(\ell(a_0a_1), \ell(b_0b_1), d_G(a_0, b_0), d_G(a_0, b_1), d_G(a_1, b_0), d_G(a_1, b_1))$ is compliant. Because of Lemma 14, Equation (4) can then be written, for each $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$, as

$$\Psi_1(\kappa; b_0, b_1) = \sum \varrho_+(\ell(a_0a_1), \ell(b_0b_1), d_G(a_0, b_0), d_G(a_0, b_1), d_G(a_1, b_0), d_G(a_1, b_1)), \quad (5)$$

where the sum ranges over all oriented edges $(a_0, a_1) \in E_A$ such that $(a_0, a_1) \in \text{Type}_1(b_0, b_1)$ and $\Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)$ holds.

Consider a fixed $\kappa = (i_{0,0}, i_{0,1}, i_{1,0}, i_{1,1}) \in [k]^4$. Again, we omit the dependency on κ when clear from the context.

We reuse the construction in Lemma 10 that in $O(m2^{4k-3}B(m, 4k-3))$ time gives points $p(a_0, a_1) \in \mathbb{R}^{4k-4}$ (for each $(a_0, a_1) \in E_A$) and rectangles $R(b_0, b_1) \subset \mathbb{R}^{4k-4}$ such that

$$p(a_0, a_1) \in R(b_0, b_1) \iff \Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1).$$

For each edge $(a_0, a_1) \in E_A$, we append to $p(a_0, a_1)$ an extra coordinate given by

$$p_{\text{extra}}(a_0, a_1) = d_G(a_1, s_{i_{1,0}}) + d_G(a_1, s_{i_{0,1}}) - d_G(a_0, s_{i_{0,0}}) - d_G(a_0, s_{i_{1,1}}).$$

Let $p^+(a_0, a_1)$ be the resulting point in \mathbb{R}^{4k-3} . Similarly, we extend the rectangle $R(b_0, b_1)$ by an extra dimension by taking the Cartesian product with the interval

$$I_{\text{extra}}(b_0, b_1) = [d_G(s_{i_{1,0}}, b_0) + d_G(s_{i_{0,1}}, b_1) - d_G(s_{i_{0,0}}, b_0) - d_G(s_{i_{1,1}}, b_1), +\infty).$$

Let $R^+(b_0, b_1)$ be the resulting rectangle in $4k - 3$ dimensions. Computing these points and intervals takes additional $O(m)$ time, once we have precomputed the distances from the portals to all vertices.

We note that $p^+(a_0, a_1) \in R^+(b_0, b_1)$ if and only if $\Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)$ and $p_{\text{extra}}(a_0, a_1) \in I_{\text{extra}}(b_0, b_1)$ holds. The property $\Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)$ translates into

$$\forall (\alpha, \beta) \in \{0, 1\}^2: \quad i_{\alpha, \beta} \text{ is the smallest index } i \text{ such that } s_i \text{ lies in some shortest path from } a_\alpha \text{ to } b_\beta.$$

The condition $p_{\text{extra}}(\kappa; a_0, a_1) \in I_{\text{extra}}(\kappa; b_0, b_1)$ is equivalent to

$$d_G(a_1, s_{i_{1,0}}) + d_G(a_1, s_{i_{1,1}}) - d_G(a_0, s_{i_{0,0}}) - d_G(a_0, s_{i_{0,1}}) \geq d_G(s_{i_{0,0}}, b_0) + d_G(s_{i_{0,1}}, b_1) - d_G(s_{i_{1,0}}, b_0) - d_G(s_{i_{1,1}}, b_1),$$

which, under the assumption that $\Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)$ holds, becomes

$$d_G(a_1, b_0) + d_G(a_1, b_1) - d_G(a_0, b_0) - d_G(a_0, b_1) \geq 0.$$

Since $L(x_{0,0}, x_{0,1}, x_{1,0}, x_{1,1}) = x_{1,0} + x_{1,1} - x_{0,0} - x_{0,1}$, this is precisely the condition for (a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1) to be of type 1. We summarize

$$p^+(a_0, a_1) \in R^+(b_0, b_1) \iff (a_0, a_1) \in \text{Type}_1(b_0, b_1) \text{ and } \Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1).$$

Therefore, for each $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$, we can rewrite Equation (5) as

$$\Psi_1(\kappa; b_0, b_1) = \sum \varrho_+(\ell(a_0 a_1), \ell(b_0 b_1), d_G(a_0, b_0), d_G(a_0, b_1), d_G(a_1, b_0), d_G(a_1, b_1)), \quad (6)$$

where the sum is over all points $p^+(a_0, a_1) \in R^+(b_0, b_1)$.

For each $(a_0, a_1) \in E_A$, we compute and store the coefficients of the 5-variable polynomial

$$\varrho_{a_0, a_1}(z, x'_{0,0}, x'_{0,1}, x'_{1,0}, x'_{1,1}) = \varrho_+(\ell(a_0 a_1), z, x'_{0,0} + \delta_{0,0}(a_0), x'_{0,1} + \delta_{0,1}(a_0), x'_{1,0} + \delta_{1,0}(a_1), x'_{1,1} + \delta_{1,1}(a_1)),$$

where we used the shorthand notation $\delta_{\alpha, \beta}(a_\alpha) = d_G(a_\alpha, s_{i_{\alpha, \beta}})$. Note that this polynomial is cubic because it is essentially a shifted version of $\varrho_+(\cdot)$; one variable is also set to a constant value. Thus, we can compute and store $\varrho_{a_0, a_1}(\cdot)$ in coefficient form in $O(1)$ time.

We use orthogonal range searching to handle the sum in the right side of Equation (6), as follows. We collect the set of points $P_A = \{p^+(a_0, a_1) \mid (a_0, a_1) \in E_A\}$. This set has $O(|E_A|) = O(m)$ points in \mathbb{R}^{4k-3} . For P_A we compute $\mathcal{P} = \{P_j \mid j \in J\}$ and the data structure of Theorem 6 in $O(mk \cdot B(m, 4k - 3))$ time.

For each $j \in J$, we compute and store the coefficients of the cubic, 5-variable polynomial

$$\varrho_j(\cdot) = \sum_{p^+(a_0, a_1) \in P_j} \varrho_{a_0, a_1}(\cdot).$$

Computing and storing these polynomials in coefficient form over all $j \in J$ takes $O(\sum_j |P_j|)$ space, and does not affect the asymptotic running time. This finishes the description of the construction of the data structure.

Consider now an edge $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$. We query the data structure with the rectangle $R = R^+(b_0, b_1)$ and get the indices J_R such that $P_A \cap R^+(b_0, b_1) = \bigsqcup_{j \in J_R} P_j$. The query takes $O(2^{4k-3} B(m, 4k - 3))$ time and $|J_R| = O(2^{4k-3} B(m, 4k - 3))$. Next we compute in $O(|J_R|) = O(2^{4k-3} B(m, 4k - 3))$ time

$$\psi(b_0, b_1) = \sum_{j \in J_R} \varrho_j(\ell(b_0 b_1), \epsilon_{0,0}(b_0), \epsilon_{0,1}(b_1), \epsilon_{1,0}(b_0), \epsilon_{1,1}(b_1)),$$

where we have used the shorthand $\epsilon_{\alpha,\beta}(b_\beta) = d_G(s_{i_{\alpha,\beta}}, b_\beta)$. Note that the computation takes $O(1)$ time per $j \in J_R$ because the polynomial ϱ_j is of constant degree and the values where we evaluate are already available.

We next argue that $\psi(b_0, b_1) = \Psi_0(\kappa; b_0, b_1)$. Using the definition of ϱ_j , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(b_0, b_1) &= \sum_{j \in J_R} \sum_{p^+(a_0, a_1) \in P_j} \varrho_{a_0, a_1}(\ell(b_0 b_1), \epsilon_{0,0}(b_0), \epsilon_{0,1}(b_1), \epsilon_{1,0}(b_0), \epsilon_{1,1}(b_1)) \\ &= \sum_{p^+(a_0, a_1) \in R^+(b_0, b_1)} \varrho_{a_0, a_1}(\ell(b_0 b_1), \epsilon_{0,0}(b_0), \epsilon_{0,1}(b_1), \epsilon_{1,0}(b_0), \epsilon_{1,1}(b_1)). \end{aligned}$$

Because $p^+(a_0, a_1) \in R^+(b_0, b_1)$, the predicate $\Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)$ holds, and thus for all $\alpha, \beta \in \{0, 1\}$

$$\epsilon_{\alpha,\beta}(b_\beta) + \delta_{\alpha,\beta}(a_\alpha) = d_G(s_{i_{\alpha,\beta}}, b_\beta) + d_G(a_\alpha, s_{i_{\alpha,\beta}}) = d_G(a_\alpha, b_\beta),$$

which means that, whenever $p^+(a_0, a_1) \in R^+(b_0, b_1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_{a_0, a_1}(\ell(b_0 b_1), \epsilon_{0,0}(b_0), \epsilon_{0,1}(b_1), \epsilon_{1,0}(b_0), \epsilon_{1,1}(b_1)) &= \\ \varrho_+(\ell(a_0 a_1), \ell(b_0 b_1), d_G(a_0, b_0), d_G(a_0, b_1), d_G(a_1, b_0), d_G(a_1, b_1)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for the fixed κ under consideration, the value $\psi(b_0, b_1)$ we have computed is

$$\sum_{p^+(a_0, a_1) \in R^+(b_0, b_1)} \varrho_+(\ell(a_0 a_1), \ell(b_0 b_1), d_G(a_0, b_0), d_G(a_0, b_1), d_G(a_1, b_0), d_G(a_1, b_1))$$

which is $\Psi_1(\kappa; b_0, b_1)$ because of Equation (6). In total, we spend $O(2^{4k-3} B(m, 4k-3))$ time per edge $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$ to compute $\Psi_0(\kappa; b_0, b_1)$. ◀

► **Lemma 16.** *We can compute $\iint_{p \in \mathcal{G}(E_A), q \in \mathcal{G}(E_B)} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q) dp dq$ in $O(m2^{4k-3} k^4 B(m, 4k-3))$ time.*

Proof. We use Lemma 15 to compute for each type $\tau \in \{1, 2\}$ and indices $\kappa \in [k]^4$ the values $\Psi_\tau(\kappa; b_0, b_1)$ for all $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$. This takes $O(k^4)$ uses of Lemma 15, and therefore we spend $O(m2^{4k-3} k^4 B(m, 4k-3))$ time. As discussed at the start of Section 4.2, we have that $\iint_{p \in \mathcal{G}(E_A), q \in \mathcal{G}(E_B)} d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q) dp dq$ is

$$\sum_{(a_0, a_1) \in E_A} \sum_{(b_0, b_1) \in E_B} \xi(\ell(a_0 a_1), \ell(b_0 b_1), d_G(a_0, b_0), d_G(a_0, b_1), d_G(a_1, b_0), d_G(a_1, b_1)).$$

Because for each $(a_0, a_1) \in E_A$ and each $(b_0, b_1) \in E_B$ there is exactly one $\kappa \in [k]^4$ such that $\Phi(\kappa; a_0, a_1, b_0, b_1)$, and because the types complement each other, this last sum is

$$\sum_{\kappa \in [k]^4} \sum_{\tau \in \{1, 2\}} \sum_{(b_0, b_1) \in E_B} \Psi_\tau(\kappa; b_0, b_1).$$

With this expression, it is clear we can obtain the result in $O(|E_B| \cdot k^4 \cdot 2)$ additional time. ◀

4.3 Global mean

Let G be a graph with n vertices and m edges defining the continuous graph \mathcal{G} . Let H be a subgraph of G defining a continuous graph $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. We use a divide-and-conquer approach to

compute $\text{sumdist}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$. The approach is very similar to that in Section 3.3 for the diameter, and thus we only emphasize the differences.

Let (A, B, S) be a separation in G . We use the notation defined before Theorem 12 introducing for $X \in \{A, B\}$, and the graphs \mathcal{H}_X and \mathcal{G}'_X . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sumdist}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}) = & \iint_{p \in \mathcal{G}(E_A), q \in \mathcal{G}(E_B)} d_G(p, q) dp dq - \iint_{p, q \in \mathcal{G}(H[S])} d_G(p, q) dp dq \\ & + \text{sumdist}(\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{G}'_A) + \text{sumdist}(\mathcal{H}_B, \mathcal{G}'_B). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The first term can be computed using Lemma 16, which depends on $|S|$. The second term can be computed in $O(km \log n + k^2)$ time because, after computing the distances from S , it is a problem of size $O(k^2)$. Dividing $\text{sumdist}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ by $\ell(\mathcal{H})^2$, we obtain $\text{mean}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$. As in Section 3.3, we have two regimes.

► **Theorem 17.** *Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer constant. Let G be a graph with n vertices, treewidth at most k , nonnegative edge-lengths, and let \mathcal{G} be the corresponding continuous graph. Let H be a subgraph of G and let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be the corresponding continuous subgraph. We can compute $\text{mean}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ in $O(n \log^{4k-2} n)$ time.*

► **Theorem 18.** *Let G be a graph with n vertices, treewidth at most k , nonnegative edge-lengths, and let \mathcal{G} be the corresponding continuous graph. Let H be a subgraph of G and let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be the corresponding continuous subgraph. We can compute $\text{mean}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ in $n^{1+\varepsilon} 2^{O(k)}$ time, for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$.*

5 Planar graphs

In this section, we consider a continuous graph \mathcal{G} defined by a planar graph G . Note that $\ell(e)$ is not related in any way to the length of e in any planar embedding of G .

In this section, we show how to compute the maximum eccentricity over all points on the boundary of a face in $O(n \log n)$ time. Further, we show that the same approach can be used to compute the mean from all points of a face with respect to the continuous graph in $O(n \log n)$ time. This completes the following statement.

► **Theorem 3.** *For a continuous planar graph \mathcal{G} with n vertices and F faces, we can compute its diameter $\text{diam}(\mathcal{G})$ and its mean distance $\text{mean}(\mathcal{G})$ in $O(nF \log n)$ time.*

To achieve this, we fix an embedding of G , obtaining a *plane graph*. An embedding in this setting may be described combinatorially: for each vertex, we are given the cyclic order of the edges around each vertex. For any face f of G , let \mathcal{G}_f be the set of points on the boundary of f . Our goal is to compute the eccentricity for the points of \mathcal{G}_f .

In the following, we assume that the boundary of f is a cycle. This can be achieved by cutting open some trees incident to f and using zero-length edges.

To compute maximum eccentricity and mean with respect to a face in $O(n \log n)$ time, we need to maintain various information in an efficient data structure. For this purpose, we adapt top trees.

Previous algorithms [11, 17, 21, 31] can be easily adapted to compute in $O(n \log n)$ time, for each vertex v incident to a face f , the vertex of G that is furthest from v . To see this, note that these algorithms dynamically maintain a shortest-path tree from v , as v moves along f , and the vertices dynamically store as a label the distance from the source. Adding

to this data structure a layer to report the vertex that is furthest from v , that is, the vertex with maximum label, the result follows. Our results for planar graphs extend this idea to continuous graphs, after overcoming several difficulties. In particular, we need to handle points on edges outside the shortest-path tree, and the source itself can be anywhere on the edges bounding f . We handle this by noting that, in the dual graph, the edges outside the shortest-path tree define a spanning tree. We maintain this spanning tree with weights using a dynamic data structure. However, we need to support an unusual update: to increase the weights for all the edges to the left of a given path. We accomplish this by adapting top trees to support this operation in $O(\log n)$ time.

5.1 Dynamic forests

We need two different data structures that dynamically maintain a forest with real weights. The first one is a *vertex-weighted forest* that implicitly stores a real value associated with each vertex, and supports the following operations:

- $\text{CREATE}(\lambda)$: It makes a new tree with a single node of associated value λ .
- $\text{CUT}(e)$: It removes the edge e from the tree that contains it.
- $\text{LINK}(u, v)$: It adds the edge uv .
- $\text{GETNODEVALUE}(v)$: It returns the value associated with node v .
- $\text{ADDTREE}(\Delta, v)$: It adds Δ to the value of each node in the tree that contains v .
- $\text{MAXTREE}(v)$: It returns the maximum associated value in the tree that contains v .
- $\text{SUMTREE}(v)$: It returns the sum of the weights over all nodes in the tree that contains v .


There are several data structures that can handle these operations in $O(\log n)$ amortised time per operation, such as Euler-tour trees [29, 36], link-cut trees [26, 35], top trees [2], or self-adjusting top trees [37].

The second data structure is an *edge-weighted embedded forest* that implicitly stores a real value associated with each edge. The forest is *embedded*, meaning that the circular order of the edges around each vertex is prescribed. We consistently use *clockwise order* around each vertex; it is best to fix one consistently. We say that an edge e is *to the left* (resp. *to the right*) of a path $\pi = v_0v_1 \dots v_k$ if e is not in π , it is incident to an interior vertex v_i of π ($i \neq 0, k$), and at v_i the clockwise order with respect to e and the two path edges incident to v_i is $v_{i-1}v_i, e, v_iv_{i+1}$ (resp. the clockwise order is $v_iv_{i+1}, e, v_{i-1}v_i$). For trees, an edge cannot be both to the right and to the left of a path, and an edge incident to the endpoint of a path is neither to the left nor to the right of the path.

The data structure for edge-weighted embedded forests supports the following operations.

- $\text{CREATE}()$: It makes a new tree with a single node.
- $\text{CUT}(e)$: It removes the edge e from the tree that contains it.
- $\text{LINK}(u, v, e_u, e_v, \lambda_{uv})$: It adds the edge uv with associated value λ_{uv} ; the edge uv is inserted such that it is clockwise after e_u at u and clockwise after e_v at v ; see Figure 7, left. The value e_u (resp. e_v) is empty, if u (resp. v) had degree 0 before the edge insertion.
- $\text{GETEDGEVALUE}(e)$: It returns the value associated to edge e .
- $\text{ADDLEFTHPATH}(\Delta, u, v)$: It adds the value Δ to each edge that is on a subtree rooted at the endpoint of an edge that is to the left of the path from u to v ; see Figure 7, right.
- $\text{MAXTREE}(u)$: It returns the maximum edge value in the tree that contains u .

Note that $\text{ADDLEFTHPATH}(\Delta, u, v)$ and $\text{ADDLEFTRHPATH}(\Delta, v, u)$ give different results. Calling $\text{ADDLEFTRHPATH}(\Delta, v, u)$ adds Δ to the edges in the subtrees to the *right* of the path from u to v .




■ **Figure 7** Left: operation $\text{LINK}(u, v, e_u, e_v, \lambda_{uv})$ for edge-weighted embedded forest. Right: with the operation $\text{ADDLEFTHPATH}(\Delta, u, v)$, the edges in the shadow subtrees increase their value by Δ .

We have not been able to trace in the literature a data structure with an operation like ADDLEFTHPATH . There are at least two data structures that can handle these operations in $O(\log n)$ amortised time per operation. The first option is to use self-adjusting top trees [37], which were explicitly designed to keep track of the cyclic order of the edges around each vertex. The second option is to use an adaptation of top trees [2] to handle embeddings, as used by Holm and Rotenberg [30] (without weights).

► **Lemma 19.** *An edge-weighted embedded forest with operations CREATE , CUT , LINK , GETEDGEVALUE , ADDLEFTHPATH and MAXTREE can be maintained in $O(\log n)$ amortised time per operation, where n is the number of nodes in the data structure.*

Proof. We describe an adaptation of top trees. First, we use *ternarization*: each vertex of degree at least 4 is replaced by a chain of degree 3 vertices. See Figure 8. The order in the chain is given by the cyclic order of the edges. It is important to note that this does not change the set of edges that is to the left of a given path. It is cumbersome but standard that we have to keep a way to identify edges in the original forest and the transformed forest. We keep track of each vertex of the cyclic order of its edges. The new edges in the forest have weight $-\infty$, and thus they never define the maximum and any addition of finite weight does not alter it. From now on, we only discuss how to maintain a forest of maximum degree 3.




■ **Figure 8** Left: transforming a tree to a tree of maximum degree 3.

We build a top tree for each tree in the forest. In the following discussion, we assume familiarity with the presentation of top trees in [2] and follow the paradigm used there. Recall that a *path cluster* is a cluster (subtree) with two boundary vertices. For each path cluster C , we denote by $\pi(C)$ the *cluster path* of C , that is, the unique path in C that connects its two boundary vertices. For each path cluster C and each boundary vertex v of C let $\tau(C, v)$ be the connected component of C that contains v in C after the removal of the edges of $\pi(C)$; that is the *hanging part* of C at v . Therefore, the edge set of a path cluster C can be broken into five parts: the edges on $\pi(C)$, the edges in the hanging part at one boundary vertex, the edges in the hanging part at the other boundary vertex, the edges in subtrees to one side of $\pi(C)$, and the edges in subtrees to the other side of $\pi(C)$. We will keep information for each of them.

For each cluster C of the top tree, we store the following information:

- For each non-path cluster C , $\text{maxWeight}(C)$ is the maximum weight among the edges of C .
- For each non-path cluster C , $\text{extra}(C)$ is an extra additive weight we have to add to all edges of C in proper descendants of C .



■ **Figure 9** Three of the five cases that appear when a cluster is obtained from joining two clusters, that is, when the top node C is the parent of A and B in the top tree. The red path is the cluster path of C (left and centre), while the thinner, blue path is a cluster path for the children A and B . The filled dots are boundary vertices of C , the empty dots are boundary vertices of the children of A and B that are not boundary vertices for C . In all cases, w is the common boundary vertex of A and B .

- For each path cluster C , $\text{maxWeightPath}(C)$ is the maximum weight among the edges of the cluster path $\pi(C)$.
- For each path cluster C , $\text{extraPath}(C)$ is an extra additive weight we have to add to all edges of the path $\pi(C)$ in proper descendants of C .
- For each path cluster C and for each boundary vertex v of C , $\text{maxWeightHanging}(C, v)$ is the maximum weight among the edges in the hanging part $\tau(C, v)$.
- For each path cluster C and for each boundary vertex v of C , $\text{extraHanging}(C, v)$ is an extra additive weight we have to add to all edges of $\tau(C, v)$ in proper descendants of C .
- For each path cluster C , at its creation we fix an orientation of its cluster path. This means that we select one boundary point as $\text{start}(C)$ and the other as $\text{end}(C)$. The cluster path $\pi(C)$ is then oriented always from $\text{start}(C)$ to $\text{end}(C)$. We define $\text{Left}(C)$ as the set of edges in the subtrees of C to the left of $\pi(C)$. Similarly, we define $\text{Right}(C)$. ($\text{Left}(C)$ and $\text{Right}(C)$ are *not kept* with C , it is notation we use to avoid repetitions.)
- For each path cluster C , $\text{maxWeightLeft}(C)$ is the maximum weight among all the edges in $\text{Left}(C)$.
- For each path cluster C , $\text{extraLeft}(C)$ is an extra additive weight we have to add to all edges of $\text{Left}(C)$ in proper descendants of C .
- For each path cluster C , $\text{maxWeightRight}(C)$ is the maximum weight among all the edges in $\text{Right}(C)$.
- For each path cluster C , $\text{extraRight}(C)$ is an extra additive weight we have to add to all edges of $\text{Right}(C)$ in proper descendants of C .

We now discuss how this information is maintained through the internal operations of top trees. To jump to the interesting cases, we consider the function $\text{SPLIT}(C)$, where we split a path cluster C into its two forming clusters A and B ; there are two cases, shown in the left and centre of Figure 9. For each path cluster child D ($D = A$ or $D = B$ or both), we can detect whether $\pi(C)$ and $\pi(D)$ have the same orientation with the following observation: $\pi(C)$ and $\pi(D)$ have the same orientation if and only if $\text{start}(C) = \text{start}(D)$ or $\text{end}(C) = \text{end}(D)$. If $\pi(D)$ and $\pi(C)$ have the same orientation, we update

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{extraLeft}(D) &= \text{extraLeft}(D) + \text{extraLeft}(C), \\
 \text{extraRight}(D) &= \text{extraRight}(D) + \text{extraRight}(C), \\
 \text{maxWeightLeft}(D) &= \text{maxWeightLeft}(D) + \text{extraLeft}(C), \\
 \text{maxWeightRight}(D) &= \text{maxWeightRight}(D) + \text{extraRight}(C), \\
 \text{extraPath}(D) &= \text{extraPath}(D) + \text{extraPath}(C), \text{ and} \\
 \text{maxWeightPath}(D) &= \text{maxWeightPath}(D) + \text{extraPath}(C).
 \end{aligned}$$

If, on the other hand, $\pi(D)$ and $\pi(C)$ have opposite orientations, then we update

$$\begin{aligned} \text{extraLeft}(D) &= \text{extraLeft}(D) + \text{extraRight}(C), \\ \text{extraRight}(D) &= \text{extraRight}(D) + \text{extraLeft}(C), \\ \text{maxWeightLeft}(D) &= \text{maxWeightLeft}(D) + \text{extraRight}(C), \\ \text{maxWeightRight}(D) &= \text{maxWeightRight}(D) + \text{extraLeft}(C), \\ \text{extraPath}(D) &= \text{extraPath}(D) + \text{extraPath}(C), \text{ and} \\ \text{maxWeightPath}(D) &= \text{maxWeightPath}(D) + \text{extraPath}(C). \end{aligned}$$

If in a split operation both A and B are path clusters (Figure 9, left), we have to take care of the edges outside $\pi(C)$ that are incident to w because they are neither to the left nor to the right of $\pi(A)$ or $\pi(B)$. This is the green tree incident to w inside B in Figure 9, left. Because w has degree at most 3, there is at most one such edge e incident to w . If e is to the left of $\pi(C)$, then for each child D of C we set

$$\begin{aligned} \text{extraHanging}(D, w) &= \text{extraHanging}(D, w) + \text{extraLeft}(C), \text{ and} \\ \text{maxWeightHanging}(D, w) &= \text{maxWeightHanging}(D, w) + \text{extraLeft}(C). \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise e is to the right of $\pi(C)$ and we perform

$$\begin{aligned} \text{extraHanging}(D, w) &= \text{extraHanging}(D, w) + \text{extraRight}(C), \text{ and} \\ \text{maxWeightHanging}(D, w) &= \text{maxWeightHanging}(D, w) + \text{extraRight}(C). \end{aligned}$$

Finally for each boundary vertex u of C and each child $D \in \{A, B\}$ with the same boundary vertex, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \text{extraHanging}(D, u) &= \text{extraHanging}(D, u) + \text{extraHanging}(C, u), \text{ and} \\ \text{maxWeightHanging}(D, u) &= \text{maxWeightHanging}(D, u) + \text{extraHanging}(C, u). \end{aligned}$$

Let us discuss now what else has to be done during split if C is a path cluster, A is a path cluster, and B is a non-path cluster; see the center of Figure 9. Let u be the common boundary of A and C , and let $w = A \cap B$. We then have to update

$$\begin{aligned} \text{extra}(B) &= \text{extra}(B) + \text{extraHanging}(C, w), \\ \text{maxWeight}(B) &= \text{maxWeight}(B, w) + \text{extraHanging}(C, w), \\ \text{extraHanging}(A, u) &= \text{extraHanging}(A, u) + \text{extraHanging}(C, u), \\ \text{extraHanging}(A, w) &= \text{extraHanging}(A, w) + \text{extraHanging}(C, w), \\ \text{maxWeightHanging}(A, u) &= \text{maxWeightHanging}(A, u) + \text{extraHanging}(C, u), \text{ and} \\ \text{maxWeightHanging}(A, w) &= \text{maxWeightHanging}(A, w) + \text{extraHanging}(C, w). \end{aligned}$$

The other three cases of $\text{SPLIT}(C)$ are similar and simpler because there is no additional extra to the left or to the right to be kept track of. For example in the case in the right of Figure 9, all the values associated to A and B get increased by $\text{extra}(C)$.

The operation $\text{JOIN}(A, B)$ is similar. Let us consider for example the case shown in Figure 9, left, where C is obtained by merging two path clusters A and B with $w = A \cap B$, u the common boundary vertex of A and C , and v the common boundary vertex of B and C . We set $\text{extraLeft}(C)$, $\text{extraRight}(C)$, $\text{extraPath}(C)$, $\text{extraHanging}(C, u)$ and $\text{extraHanging}(C, v)$

to 0 and set

$$\begin{aligned}\maxWeightHanging(C, u) &= \maxWeightHanging(A, u), \\ \maxWeightHanging(C, v) &= \maxWeightHanging(B, v), \text{ and} \\ \maxWeightPath(C) &= \max\{\maxWeightPath(A), \maxWeightPath(B)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Then, we look into the left and right sides of $\pi(C)$. We can select, for example, $\text{start}(C) = u$ and $\text{end}(C) = v$, and initially set $\maxWeightLeft(C) = \maxWeightRight(C) = -\infty$. Then, if $\text{start}(A) = u$, we have to update

$$\begin{aligned}\maxWeightLeft(C) &= \max\{\maxWeightLeft(C), \maxWeightLeft(A)\}, \text{ and} \\ \maxWeightRight(C) &= \max\{\maxWeightRight(C), \maxWeightRight(A)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Otherwise $\text{start}(A) \neq u$ and we update

$$\begin{aligned}\maxWeightLeft(C) &= \max\{\maxWeightLeft(C), \maxWeightRight(A)\}, \text{ and} \\ \maxWeightRight(C) &= \max\{\maxWeightRight(C), \maxWeightLeft(A)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if $\text{end}(B) = v$, we apply

$$\begin{aligned}\maxWeightLeft(C) &= \max\{\maxWeightLeft(C), \maxWeightLeft(B)\}, \text{ and} \\ \maxWeightRight(C) &= \max\{\maxWeightRight(C), \maxWeightRight(B)\},\end{aligned}$$

while, if $\text{end}(B) \neq v$, we set

$$\begin{aligned}\maxWeightLeft(C) &= \max\{\maxWeightLeft(C), \maxWeightRight(B)\}, \text{ and} \\ \maxWeightRight(C) &= \max\{\maxWeightRight(C), \maxWeightLeft(B)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have to take care for the unique edge e attached to w outside of $\pi(C)$, if it exists, and the possible subtree of e . If e is to the left of $\pi(C)$, then we set $\maxWeightLeft(C)$ to

$$\max\{\maxWeightLeft(C), \maxWeightHanging(A, w), \maxWeightHanging(B, w)\}.$$

(Only one of the last two values is not infinity, because e belongs to only one of the children.) If e exists and is not to the left of $\pi(C)$, then we set $\maxWeightRight(C)$ to


$$\max\{\maxWeightRight(C), \maxWeightHanging(A, w), \maxWeightHanging(B, w)\}.$$

An easy way to know whether e is to the left or the right of $\pi(C)$, is to store for each cluster the extreme edges of $\pi(C)$. The two edges of $\pi(C)$ incident to w can then be obtained from $\pi(A)$ and $\pi(B)$. The other cases for join are similar and simpler.

With this, we can implement the desired operations. CREATE and CUT are implemented as usual. The function LINK is implemented by taking care of the ternarization.

The function GETEDGEVALUE(uv) is implemented as $\maxWeightPath(\text{EXPOSE}(u, v))$. The function MAXTREE(u) is implemented calling $\maxWeight(\text{EXPOSE}(u))$.

The function ADDLEFTPATH(Δ, u, v) is implemented by calling $\text{EXPOSE}(u, v)$, which returns the root node R of the top tree with u and v as boundary vertices. If $u = \text{start}(R)$, then we increase $\text{extraLeft}(R)$ and $\maxWeightLeft(R)$ by Δ , otherwise we increase $\text{extraRight}(R)$ and $\maxWeightRight(R)$ by Δ . ◀



■ **Figure 10** The red subtree, the blue subtree, and the green edges. Edges that do not belong to T_s are dotted. From left to right we are making a pivot operation in T_s where xy pivots in and zy pivots out. The red vertices that become blue with the pivot operation are marked with white interior. The yellow region tells where changes occur.


5.2 Multiple-source shortest paths

We build upon the results on multiple-source shortest-paths for planar graphs [11, 17, 21, 31]. In this setting, we have a fixed face f in a plane graph, and want to encode all shortest-path trees from *each* vertex incident to f . For our problem in a continuous setting, it seems most convenient to follow the paradigm of Cabello, Chambers and Erickson [11], because it is already based on sliding the source continuously along an edge.


Let s (for *source*) be a vertex inserted on an edge uv of f and let T_s be a shortest-path tree rooted at s to all vertices of G . We want to maintain T_s as s slides continuously along uv , say from u to v . In general, T_s consists of the edges su and sv , a subtree T_u rooted at u , which we call the *red subtree*, and a subtree T_v rooted at v , which we call the *blue subtree*. It is possible that the edge su does not belong to T_s , and in this case the red subtree is empty; similarly, if the edge sv does not belong to T_s , resulting in an empty blue subtree. We further classify the edges of G into three groups: the *red edges* have both endpoints in the red tree T_u , the *blue edges* have both endpoints in the blue tree T_v , and *green edges* have one endpoint in each subtree. See Figure 10.

In a generic situation, as we slide s towards v by a *sufficiently small* length $\lambda > 0$, we increase the distance from s to each red vertex by λ , and decrease the distance from s to each blue vertex by λ . During the sliding of s , at some critical points the red and blue trees change and have to be updated. More precisely, consider a green edge xy such that x is blue and y is red. If at some moment the source s reaches a point such that $d_{T_s}(s, v) + d_{T_s}(v, x) + \ell(xy) = d_{T_s}(s, u) + d_{T_s}(u, y)$, then the edge xy enters the blue tree T_v , and the edge connecting y to its parent z in the red tree T_u has to be removed. With this operation, the subtree of T_u rooted at y becomes blue, and the colour of some edges changes. This is a *pivot operation*, where the edge xy pivots in T_s and the edge zy pivots out. See Figure 10. (In non-generic cases, one has to be more careful about when an edge pivots in.)

So far, we have not used planarity in any way, and the source s can slide along any edge. If we restrict ourselves to *plane graphs* and the edge lengths are generic enough, Cabello, Chambers and Erickson [11] show that each edge pivots in and out $O(1)$ times, and at each moment there is only one candidate pivot to perform. They also show a randomized perturbation scheme that works with high probability [11]. Erickson, Fox and Lkhamsuren [21] present a *deterministic* perturbation scheme that guarantees genericity and



■ **Figure 11** Left: example of f -interval. Right: example showing the cyclic order of s_0, s_1, \dots, s_k in Theorem 20. Note that, in general, s_i is not a vertex, but a point on \mathcal{G}_f . For all sources s in the f -interval $[s_i, s_{i+1}]_f$, T_s is the tree T_i .



■ **Figure 12** The vertices $m_s(e)$ for $e \in C_s$ and how they move.

has no asymptotic overhead. Note that the perturbations are made only to detect in which order the pivot operations have to be performed, but the operations can then be performed in the unperturbed, original setting.

We need a cyclic order of the points of \mathcal{G}_f . For two points s, s' along \mathcal{G}_f , the f -interval $[s, s']_f$ is the set of points $\tilde{s} \in \mathcal{G}_f$ such that the counterclockwise traversal of f starting from s passes through \tilde{s} before passing s' . See Figure 11, also for easier parsing of Theorem 20.

► **Theorem 20** (Cabello, Chambers and Erickson [11], Erickson, Fox and Lkhamsuren [21]). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a plane graph with n vertices and non-negative edge lengths. Let f be any fixed face of G such that the facial walk of f is a cycle, let s_0 be any vertex on the boundary of f and let T_0 be the shortest-path tree rooted at s_0 . A sequence of triples $(s_1, e_1, e'_1), \dots, (s_k, e_k, e'_k) \in \mathcal{G}_f \times E \times E$ can be computed in $O(n \log n)$ time such that:*


- $k = O(n)$;
- $s_i \in [s_0, s_{i+1}]_f$ for all $i \in [k-1]$;
- T_0 is a shortest-path tree for all sources $s \in [s_0, s_1]_f$;
- the tree T_i (for $i \in [k]$), obtained inductively from T_{i-1} by pivoting e_i in and pivoting e'_i out, is a shortest-path tree for all sources $s \in [s_i, s_{i+1}]_f$ (where $s_{k+1} = s_0$).

5.3 Eccentricity from a face

We keep assuming that the boundary of f is a cycle. Consider any source s on \mathcal{G}_f and let T_s be the shortest-path tree from s . Let $C_s = E(G) \setminus E(T_s)$, that is, the set of edges not in the shortest-path tree. For each edge $xy \in C_s$, there is one point $m_s(xy)$ on the continuous edge $xy \subset \mathcal{G}$ with two shortest paths from s , one through x and one through y . See Figure 12 for a schema. For each edge $xy \in C_s$, we define the weight $\omega_s(xy)$ as the distance from s to $m_s(xy)$, thus $\omega_s(xy) = d_{\mathcal{G}}(s, m_s(xy)) = (d_{T_s}(s, x) + \ell(xy) + d_{T_s}(s, y))/2$.

► **Lemma 21.** *For each $s \in \mathcal{G}_f$, the eccentricity of s in \mathcal{G} is*

$$\text{ecc}(s, \mathcal{G}) = \max \left\{ \max_{x \in V} d_{T_s}(s, x), \max_{xy \in C_s} \omega_s(xy) \right\}.$$



■ **Figure 13** The dual tree C_s^* for the examples in Figure 10. The vertices a and b are added artificially as segments of the dual edge f^*g^* .

Proof. On the right hand we only have distances from s , and therefore the eccentricity is at least as large as the right hand. To see the other direction, consider the point $p^* \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $d_{\mathcal{G}}(s, p^*) = \text{ecc}(s, \mathcal{G})$. It cannot be that p^* lies in the interior of an edge e of T_s because at least one of the endpoints of e is further from s . Therefore, p^* lies on a vertex of G or in the interior of an edge of $E(G) \setminus E(T_s) = C_s$. If p^* is a vertex of G , then $d_{\mathcal{G}}(s, p^*) = d_{T_s}(s, p^*)$ is considered on the right side. If p^* lies on the interior of the edge xy of C_s , then $d_{\mathcal{G}}(s, p^*) \leq d_{\mathcal{G}}(s, m_s(xy)) = \omega_s(xy)$, which also appears on the right side. ◀

Consider the dual *plane* graph G^* of G , and let e^* be the dual edge of e . For the set C_s , define $C_s^* = \{e^* \mid e \in C_s\}$. An important insight is that C_s^* defines a spanning tree of the dual graph G^* . See Figure 13. The pair $(E(T_s), C_s)$ form a so-called *tree-cotree decomposition* of G [20]. This means that we can use a data structure to store and manipulate C_s as an *embedded* tree in the dual. We add to C_s^* two artificial vertices as follows: let g be the other face incident to the edge uv that contains s ; we add a vertex a and the edge af^* such that, cyclically around f^* , its order is adjacent to f^*g^* ; we add a vertex b and the edge bg^* such that, cyclically around g^* , its order is that of f^*g^* . Note that an edge e of C_s is green if and only if e^* lies in the a -to- b path, it is red if and only if e^* lies in a subtree to the right of the a -to- b path, and it is blue if and only if e^* lies in a subtree to the left of the a -to- b path in C_s^* .

► **Theorem 22.** *For a continuous plane graph \mathcal{G} with n vertices and a face f of \mathcal{G} , we can compute the maximum eccentricity over all points on the boundary of f in $O(n \log n)$ time.*

Proof. We change the embedding of G , if needed, to assume that f is the outer face of G and we traverse the face of f counterclockwise. As mentioned before, we may assume that the boundary of f is a cycle.

We compute and store the embedded dual graph G^* of G . We maintain pointers between the edges in the dual and the primal. Since the embedding is going to be static, for each vertex of G or G^* , we store explicitly the cyclic order of the edges incident to it and rank them so that, given a sequence of three edges incident to the same vertex, we can identify in $O(1)$ time whether they are clockwise or counterclockwise.

For a fixed vertex s_0 from f , we compute the shortest-path tree $T_0 = T_{s_0}$ from s_0 to the vertices of G . Computing the sequence $(s_1, e_1, e'_1), \dots, (s_k, e_k, e'_k) \in \mathcal{G}_f \times E \times E$ of Theorem 20 takes $O(n \log n)$ time.

For $i \in [k]$, we write d_i, T_i, C_i^*, m_i and ω_i instead of $d_{s_i}, T_{s_i}, C_{s_i}^*, m_{s_i}$ and ω_{s_i} .

We store T_0 using the data structure of Section 5.1 where, for each vertex u of G , the associated value is $d_{T_0}(s_0, u)$. We construct the embedded dual tree C_0^* and store it using the edge-weighted embedded forest of Lemma 19, where, for all $xy \in C_0$, the edge associated with the edge $(xy)^*$ is $\omega_0(xy)$. This initialization of T_0 and C_0^* takes $O(n \log n)$ time.

Now, we explain how to construct T_i and C_i^* for any $i \in [k]$, given a representation of T_{i-1} , where each vertex x of G has label $d_{i-1}(s_{i-1}, x)$, and a representation of the embedded dual tree C_{i-1}^* where each edge $xy \in C_{i-1}$ has value $\omega_{i-1}(xy)$. Let λ_i be the length of the f -interval $[s_{i-1}, s_i]_f$. As we move from s_{i-1} to s_i , we note the following (see Figures 10 and 12):

- For each vertex x in the red tree T_u , the distance from s to x increases by λ_i . For each vertex in the blue tree T_v , it decreases by λ_i .
- For each green edge xy , the distance from s to $m_s(xy)$ does not change because $m_s(xy)$ moves also by λ_i towards the blue edge. Thus, $\omega_s(xy)$ remains constant.
- For each red edge xy of C_s , the point $m_s(xy)$ does not move, but the distance from s to $m_s(xy)$ increases by λ_i .
- For each blue edge xy of C_s , the point $m_s(xy)$ does not move, but the distance from s to $m_s(xy)$ decreases by λ_i .

Therefore, we obtain T_i from T_{i-1} performing the following operations in the dynamic tree: if su belongs to T_{i-1} , we perform $\text{CUT}(su)$, $\text{ADDTREE}(\lambda_i, u)$ and $\text{LINK}(s, u)$; if sv belongs to T_{i-1} , we perform $\text{CUT}(sv)$, $\text{ADDTREE}(-\lambda_i, v)$ and $\text{LINK}(s, v)$; then we perform the pivot operation of cutting e_i and linking e'_i .

To obtain C_i^* from C_{i-1}^* , we perform the following operations in the dynamic tree storing C_{i-1}^* . Since the blue edges of C_s are precisely those to the left of the path from a to b , we perform $\text{ADDLEFTHPATH}(-\lambda_i, a, b)$. Since the red edges of C_s are precisely those to the right of the path from a to b , we perform $\text{ADDLEFTHPATH}(\lambda_i, b, a)$. The value of the green edges did not change. Now, we have to perform the pivot operation of deleting $(e'_i)^*$ and inserting $e_i^* = (xy)^*$ in C_i ; note the reverse order of operations with respect to the primal tree. For this, we $\text{CUT}(e'_i)$, use the data structure for the primal T_i to obtain $\text{GETNODEVALUE}(x) = d_i(s_i, x)$ and $\text{GETNODEVALUE}(y) = d_i(s_i, y)$, and compute $\omega_i(xy)$. Using the precomputed circular order of $(xy)^*$, we identify where to insert the dual edge $(xy)^*$, and call LINK to insert it.

This finishes the description of how to obtain T_i and C_i^* from T_{i-1} and C_{i-1}^* . At the end of each iteration, we can compute $\max_{x \in V} d_{T_s}(s, x)$ by performing $\text{MAXTREE}(s)$ in the data structure storing T_i , and we can compute $\max_{e \in C_i} \omega_i(e)$ using $\text{MAXTREE}(f^*)$ in the data structure storing C_i^* . From this, due to Lemma 21, we obtain $\text{ecc}(s_i, \mathcal{G})$.

When s slides over a vertex of the face, we also need to make a small update and the concept of red and blue has to be updated; we skip the easy details.

At each $i \in [k]$, we spend $O(\log n)$ amortised time for $O(1)$ operations in dynamic forests and $O(1)$ additional work. Thus, the eccentricity from each s_i is computed in $O(n \log n)$ time. Finally, note that the eccentricity has to be attained either at s_0 or at some point where the shortest-path tree changes. Therefore $\max_{p \in \mathcal{G}_f} \text{ecc}(p, \mathcal{G}) = \max_i \text{ecc}(s_i, \mathcal{G})$. ◀

Applying Theorem 22 to each face of an embedding of an n -vertex graph \mathcal{G} with F faces, we can compute its diameter in $O(nF \log n)$ time (compare to Theorem 3).

5.4 Mean from a face

The approach used to compute the diameter of planar graphs can be easily adapted to compute the mean distance. As we move the source s , with edge e we maintain the value $\nu(e) = \int_{p \in \mathcal{G}(e)} d_{\mathcal{G}}(s, p) dp$. When we slide s by $\lambda > 0$ without pivoting, the new value $\nu(e)$ is

increased by λ for the red edges, decreased by λ for the blue edges, and remains constant for the green edges. When we slide the source s along uv by $\lambda > 0$ without pivoting, for each red edge we have

$$\int_{\lambda' \in [0, \lambda]} \int_{p \in \mathcal{G}(e)} (d_{\mathcal{G}}(s, p) + \lambda') dp d\lambda' = \lambda \cdot \nu(e) + \ell(e) \cdot \lambda^2/2.$$

Therefore, it holds

$$\int_{\lambda' \in [0, \lambda]} \int_{p \in \mathcal{G}(T_u)} (d_{\mathcal{G}}(s, p) + \lambda') dp d\lambda' = \lambda \cdot \sum_{e \in E(T_u)} \nu(e) + (\lambda^2/2) \cdot \sum_{e \in E(T_u)} \ell(e).$$

Similarly, for each blue edge e , we have

$$\int_{\lambda' \in [0, \lambda]} \int_{p \in \mathcal{G}(T_v)} (d_{\mathcal{G}}(s, p) - \lambda') dp d\lambda' = \lambda \cdot \sum_{e \in E(T_v)} \nu(e) - (\lambda^2/2) \cdot \sum_{e \in E(T_v)} \ell(e).$$

Finally, for the each green edge e , we have

$$\int_{\lambda' \in [0, \lambda]} \int_{p \in \mathcal{G}(e)} (d_{\mathcal{G}}(s, p) + \lambda') dp d\lambda' = \lambda \cdot \nu(e).$$

In a dynamic forest we can maintain edge weights and return the sum of the weights in a subtree. A simple option is to assign weight 0 to all vertices and maintain it constant, subdivide each edge e with a vertex v_e , and attach the weight of e to v_e . Then, we can use a dynamic forest with vertex weights, where only some vertices have active weights. The operation `SUMTREE` returns the answer. Both values $\sum_{e \in E(T_v)} \nu(e)$ and $\sum_{e \in E(T_u)} \ell(e)$ can be maintained this way.

Finally, for the red edges e outside T_u , that is, those red edges in C_s , we can also obtain the sum of the values $\nu(e)$ and update $\nu(e)$ for those edges. This requires an update operation in the embedded forest, where we add a weight to all the edges to one side of a path, and obtain the sum of the weights on one side of a path. The dynamic forest we presented can be extended to have these operations. Sliding the source along the boundary of a face and adding the values obtained over each part, we obtain the following.

► **Theorem 23.** *Let G be a graph planar with n vertices, positive edge-lengths, and let \mathcal{G} be the corresponding continuous graph. Let H be a subgraph of G and let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be the corresponding continuous subgraph. Let f be a face in some given embedding of G . In $O(n \log n)$ time, we can compute the value*

$$\int_{s \in \mathcal{H} \cap f} \int_{q \in \mathcal{H}} d_{\mathcal{G}}(s, p) dq ds.$$

Fix an embedding of a planar graph G . By adding over all faces f of the embedding the value $\int_{s \in \mathcal{H} \cap f} \int_{q \in \mathcal{H}} d_{\mathcal{G}}(s, p) dq ds$, we can compute $\text{mean}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ in $O(nF \log n)$ time (compare to Theorem 3).

6 Conclusion

We presented the first subquadratic algorithms to compute the diameter and the mean distance in continuous graphs, for two non-trivial graph classes. We expect that the approach for graphs parameterized by the treewidth can be adapted for computing other statistics

defined by the distance between two points selected at random in a continuous subgraph $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, like a cumulative density function (CDF) and higher moments:

$$\text{for given } \delta, \text{ compute } \text{CDF}(\delta, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}) = \frac{1}{\ell(\mathcal{H})^2} \iint_{p,q \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{1}[d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q) \leq \delta] dp dq,$$

$$\text{median distance: } \sup \{ \delta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid \text{CDF}(\delta, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}) \leq 1/2 \},$$

$$\text{higher moments, such as } \frac{1}{\ell(\mathcal{H})^2} \iint_{p,q \in \mathcal{H}} (d_{\mathcal{G}}(p, q))^2 dp dq.$$

The main open question stemming from our work is whether our approach can be adapted to work in subquadratic time for arbitrary planar graphs. However, as already mentioned in the introduction, this requires dynamic trees with a set of suitable operations that—at the moment—seem to be out of reach.

References

- 1 A. Abboud, V. Vassilevska Williams, and J. Wang. Approximation and fixed parameter subquadratic algorithms for radius and diameter in sparse graphs. In *Proc. 27th Annu. ACM-SIAM Sympos. Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 377–391. SIAM, 2016. doi:10.1137/1.9781611974331.ch28.
- 2 S. Alstrup, J. Holm, K. de Lichtenberg, and M. Thorup. Maintaining information in fully dynamic trees with top trees. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 1(2):243–264, 2005. doi:10.1145/1103963.1103966.
- 3 S. Won Bae, M. De Berg, O. Cheong, J. Gudmundsson, and C. Levkopoulos. Shortcuts for the circle. *Comput. Geom. Theory Appl.*, 79:37–54, 2019. doi:10.1016/J.COMGEO.2019.01.006.
- 4 L. N. Baptista, J. B. Kennedy, and D. Mugnolo. Mean distance on metric graphs. *The Journal of Geometric Analysis*, 34(137):1–25, 2024. doi:10.1007/s12220-024-01574-0.
- 5 P. Bergé, G. Ducoffe, and M. Habib. Subquadratic-time algorithm for the diameter and all eccentricities on median graphs. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 68(1):144–193, 2024. doi:10.1007/S00224-023-10153-9.
- 6 H. 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.
- 7 H. L. Bodlaender, P. Grønås Drange, M. S. Dregi, F. V. Fomin, D. Lokshtanov, and M. Pilipczuk. A $c^k n$ 5-approximation algorithm for treewidth. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 45(2):317–378, 2016. doi:10.1137/130947374.
- 8 K. Bringmann, T. Husfeldt, and M. Magnusson. Multivariate analysis of orthogonal range searching and graph distances. *Algorithmica*, 82:2292–2315, 2020. doi:10.1007/S00453-020-00680-Z.
- 9 S. Cabello. Subquadratic algorithms for the diameter and the sum of pairwise distances in planar graphs. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 15(2):21:1–21:38, 2019. doi:10.1145/3218821.
- 10 S. Cabello. Computing the inverse geodesic length in planar graphs and graphs of bounded treewidth. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 18(2):14:1–14:26, 2022. doi:10.1145/3501303.
- 11 S. Cabello, E. W. Chambers, and J. Erickson. Multiple-source shortest paths in embedded graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 42(4):1542–1571, 2013. doi:10.1137/120864271.
- 12 S. Cabello and C. Knauer. Algorithms for graphs of bounded treewidth via orthogonal range searching. *Comput. Geom. Theory Appl.*, 42(9):815–824, 2009. doi:10.1016/j.comgeo.2009.02.001.
- 13 J. Cáceres, D. Garijo, A. González, A. Márquez, M. L. Puertas, and P. Ribeiro. Shortcut sets for the locus of plane Euclidean networks. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 334:192–205, 2018. doi:10.1016/j.amc.2018.04.010.
- 14 J.-L. De Carufel, C. Grimm, A. Maheshwari, S. Schirra, and M. H. M. Smid. Minimizing the continuous diameter when augmenting a geometric tree with a shortcut. *Comput. Geom. Theory Appl.*, 89:101631, 2020. doi:10.1016/J.COMGEO.2020.101631.

- 15 J.-L. De Carufel, C. Grimm, A. Maheshwari, and M. H. M. Smid. Minimizing the continuous diameter when augmenting paths and cycles with shortcuts. In *Proc. 15th Scandinavian Symposium and Workshops on Algorithm Theory (SWAT'16)*, volume 53 of *LIPICs*, pages 27:1–27:14. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2016. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.SWAT.2016.27.
- 16 C. E. Chen and R. S. Garfinkel. The generalized diameter of a graph. *Networks*, 12(3):335–340, 1982. doi:10.1002/net.3230120310.
- 17 D. Das, E. Kipouridis, M. Probst Gutenberg, and C. Wulff-Nilsen. A simple algorithm for multiple-source shortest paths in planar digraphs. In *Proc. 5th Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms (SOSA@SODA'22)*, pages 1–11. SIAM, 2022. doi:10.1137/1.9781611977066.1.
- 18 G. Ducoffe. Eccentricity queries and beyond using hub labels. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 930(21):128–141, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2022.07.017.
- 19 G. Ducoffe, M. Habib, and L. Viennot. Diameter computation on h -minor free graphs and graphs of bounded (distance) VC-dimension. In *Proc. 31st Annu. ACM-SIAM Sympos. Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1905–1922. SIAM, 2020. doi:10.1137/1.9781611975994.117.
- 20 D. Eppstein. Dynamic generators of topologically embedded graphs. In *Proc. 14th Annu. ACM-SIAM Sympos. Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 599–608. SIAM, 2003. doi:10.5555/644108.644208.
- 21 J. Erickson, K. Fox, and L. Lkhamsuren. Holiest minimum-cost paths and flows in surface graphs. In *Proc. 50th Annu. ACM Sympos. Theory Comput. (STOC)*, pages 1319–1332. ACM, 2018. doi:10.1145/3188745.3188904.
- 22 L. Friedlander. Genericity of simple eigenvalues for a metric graph. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 146:149–156, 2005. doi:10.1007/BF02773531.
- 23 D. Garijo, A. Márquez, N. Rodríguez, and R. I. Silveira. Computing optimal shortcuts for networks. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, 279(1):26–37, 2019. doi:10.1016/j.ejor.2019.05.018.
- 24 D. Garijo, A. Márquez, and R. Silveira. Continuous mean distance of a weighted graph. *Results in Mathematics*, 78(139):1–36, 2023. doi:10.1007/s00025-023-01902-w.
- 25 P. Gawrychowski, H. Kaplan, S. Mozes, M. Sharir, and O. Weimann. Voronoi diagrams on planar graphs, and computing the diameter in deterministic $O(n^{5/3})$ time. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 50(2):509–554, 2021. doi:10.1137/18M1193402.
- 26 A. V. Goldberg, M. D. Grigoriadis, and R. E. Tarjan. Use of dynamic trees in a network simplex algorithm for the maximum flow problem. *Mathematical Programming*, 50:277–290, 1991. doi:10.1007/BF01594940.
- 27 J. Gudmundsson and Y. Sha. Augmenting graphs to minimize the radius. *Comput. Geom. Theory Appl.*, 114(101996):1–14, 2023. doi:10.1016/j.comgeo.2023.101996.
- 28 J. Gudmundsson and S. Wong. Improving the dilation of a metric graph by adding edges. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 18(3-Article 20):1–14, 2022. doi:10.1145/3517807.
- 29 M. Henzinger and V. King. Randomized fully dynamic graph algorithms with polylogarithmic time per operation. *Journal of the ACM*, 46(4):502–516, 1999. doi:10.1145/320211.320215.
- 30 J. Holm and E. Rotenberg. Dynamic planar embeddings of dynamic graphs. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 61(4):1054–1083, 2017. doi:10.1007/S00224-017-9768-7.
- 31 P. N. Klein. Multiple-source shortest paths in planar graphs. In *Proc. 16th Annu. ACM-SIAM Sympos. Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 146–155. SIAM, 2005. doi:10.5555/1070432.1070454.
- 32 G. Lumer. Connecting of local operators and evolution equations on networks. In *Potential Theory Copenhagen 1979*, pages 219–234. Springer-Verlag, 1980. doi:10.1007/BFb0086338.
- 33 L. Monier. Combinatorial solutions of multidimensional divide-and-conquer recurrences. *Algorithms*, 1(1):60–74, 1980. doi:10.1016/0196-6774(80)90005-X.
- 34 L. Roditty and V. Vassilevska Williams. Fast approximation algorithms for the diameter and radius of sparse graphs. In *Proc. 45th Annu. ACM Sympos. Theory Comput. (STOC)*, pages 515–524. ACM, 2013. doi:10.1145/2488608.2488673.

- 35 D. D. Sleator and R. E. Tarjan. A data structure for dynamic trees. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 26(3):362–391, 1983. doi:10.1016/0022-0000(83)90006-5.
- 36 R. E. Tarjan. Dynamic trees as search trees via euler tours, applied to the network simplex algorithm. *Mathematical Programming*, 77:169–177, 1997. doi:10.1007/BF02614369.
- 37 R. E. Tarjan and R. F. Werneck. Self-adjusting top trees. In *Proc. 16th Annu. ACM-SIAM Sympos. Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 813–822. SIAM, 2005. doi:10.5555/1070432.1070547.