

Augmenting Plane Straight-Line Graphs to Meet Parity Constraints

Aleksander Bjørn Grodt Christiansen ✉ 


Technical University of Denmark, Denmark

Linda Kleist ✉ 

Universität Potsdam, Potsdam, Germany

Irene Parada ✉ 

Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Spain

Eva Rotenberg ✉ 

Technical University of Denmark, Denmark

Abstract

Given a plane geometric graph G on n vertices, we want to augment it so that given parity constraints of the vertex degrees are met. In other words, given a subset R of the vertices, we are interested in a plane geometric supergraph G' such that exactly the vertices of R have odd degree in $G' \setminus G$. We show that the question whether such a supergraph exists can be decided in polynomial time for two interesting cases. First, when the vertices are in convex position, we present a linear-time algorithm. Building on this insight, we solve the case when G is a plane geometric path in $O(n \log n)$ time. This solves an open problem posed by Catana, Olaverri, Tejel, and Urrutia (Appl. Math. Comput. 2020).

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Computational geometry

Keywords and phrases Plane geometric graphs, Augmentation problems, Parity constraints, Geometric paths, Convex geometric graphs

Related Version A version of this paper was presented at the 50th International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (WG 2024).

Funding *Aleksander Bjørn Grodt Christiansen*: Supported by the VILLUM Foundation grant 37507 “Efficient Recomputations for Changeful Problems”

Irene Parada: Serra Hünter fellow and acknowledges the support of Independent Research Fund Denmark grant 2020-2023 (9131-00044B) “Dynamic Network Analysis”, the Margarita Salas Fellowship funded by the Ministry of Universities of Spain and the EU (NextGenerationEU), and grants PID2019-104129GB-I00 and PID2023-150725NB-I00 funded by MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033.

Eva Rotenberg: Partially supported by the VILLUM Foundation grant 37507 “Efficient Recomputations for Changeful Problems” and the Independent Research Fund Denmark grant 2020-2023 (9131-00044B) “Dynamic Network Analysis”.


1 Introduction

A fundamental class of problems in graph drawing concerns augmenting existing embedded graphs, such that the resulting graph has some desired properties. In this paper, we approach the natural question of augmenting graphs to meet degree constraints. Given a geometric graph, that is, a graph together with a planar straight-line embedding, the problem is to augment the graph with straight-line edges such that constraints are met concerning the degrees of vertices in the resulting plane geometric graph. Even in the simplest version of this problem, where the degree constraints are modulo two, even or odd degree, the problem is NP-hard for general graphs [9], and conjectured to be NP-hard even for trees [9]. In this

paper, we resolve the question about the tractability of parity constraint augmentation for geometric paths, showing it to be near-linear time solvable.

Our solution uses a connection between the parity constraint satisfaction problem and the problem of finding a compatible geometric spanning tree of a geometric graph. We use this connection to characterize a class of geometric paths which always admit an augmentation (except for obvious negative cases). The remaining paths share enough structural properties with paths on convex point sets, that we can use the same approach for these as for graphs on points in convex position. For such graphs, we give a surprisingly simple solution that computes the answer via a linear bottom-up traversal of the (arbitrarily rooted) weak dual graph.

The Planar Parity Constraint Satisfaction Problem. A *geometric graph* $G = (V, E)$ is a graph drawn in the plane such that its vertex set V is a point set in general position (no three points are collinear) and its edge set E is a set of straight-line segments between those points. A geometric graph is *plane* if no two of its edges cross and it is *convex* if its vertices are in convex position (regardless of its edges). The *visibility graph* of a plane geometric graph G , denoted by $\text{Vis}(G)$, is a geometric graph that has V as its vertex set and two vertices u and v share an edge in $\text{Vis}(G)$ if and only if $uv \notin E$ and uv does not cross any edge in E (so G can be augmented by uv). Note that $\text{Vis}(G)$ might have many edges and can be far from being plane; see Figure 1a for an example.



■ **Figure 1** (a) A plane geometric graph G (in black) and its visibility graph $\text{Vis}(G)$ (in gray). (b) A solution set for G and the four unhappy vertices (red squares).

We are interested in plane subgraphs G^+ of $\text{Vis}(G)$ such that $G \cup G^+$ satisfies given parity constraints for the vertex degrees. These constraints can be interpreted as a set of *unhappy* vertices R that would like to change the parity of their degree in G . We refer to vertices that are not unhappy as *happy*. A set of edges H in $\text{Vis}(G)$ is called a *solution set* for (G, R) if H is crossing-free and the vertices that have odd degree in H are exactly the vertices in R ; see Figure 1b. Note that by the handshaking lemma, a solution set can only exist if $|R|$ is even.

Our contribution. In Section 2, we present a linear-time algorithm that, given a convex plane geometric graph $G = (V, E)$ and any set R of unhappy vertices, outputs whether there exists a solution set. Building on these insights, in Section 3, we present a conceptually elegant $O(|V| \log |V|)$ -time algorithm that decides the existence of solution sets for plane geometric paths, solving an open problem by Catana et al. [9]. We also characterize those paths that admit a positive answer for any even subset R of unhappy vertices.

Related work. In graph augmentation problems, one is typically interested in adding (few) new edges to a given graph in order to achieve some desired property; for instance, 2-connectivity, a reduced diameter, to obtain an Eulerian graph, or meet other desired vertex degrees. These problems arise in many applications like transportation and telecommunication networks and constitute an active research topic in graph theory and algorithms. Augmenting graphs to meet connectivity constraints is well-studied in the general case [8, 10, 15, 16, 28]

as well as in the planar case [22, 29], and in the plane geometric case [1, 4, 5, 19, 23, 29, 30]. Reducing the diameter has also received considerable attention [2, 6, 12, 17].

The study of augmentation to meet parity constraints and, in particular, structures involving the set of odd-degree vertices has a long history. *T*-joins are subgraphs in which the set of vertices of odd degree is exactly *T*. The minimum-weight *T*-join problem can be efficiently solved and generalizes several problems including the Chinese postman problem [14, 24]. The concept of odd-vertex pairing also appears in classic results [21, 26].

Augmentation to meet parity constraints has also been considered as a relaxed version of the more general problem of augmenting graphs to meet a certain degree sequence. For abstract graphs, Dabrowski et al. [13] provide a polynomial-time algorithm to achieve parity constraints. For both the plane topological setting, where edges are not required to be straight lines, and the plane geometric setting, Catana et al. [9] showed that deciding whether a general plane (geometric) graph can be augmented to meet a set of parity constraints is NP-complete; even in more restricted cases where the set of unhappy vertices *R* is *V* or all odd-degree vertices (i.e., the goal is to make the graph Eulerian). For maximal outerplane graphs in the topological setting, they show how to decide in polynomial time if the parity constraints can be met in all of the cases above. They also show that the same holds if one can only augment by adding a matching. In contrast, deciding whether a plane geometric cycle can be augmented with a (perfect) geometric matching so that all vertices change parities is known to be NP-complete [27].

The geometric setting has also been studied in a slightly different light [3, 7]. Given a set of vertices along with a set of parity constraints for these vertices, Aichholzer et al. [3] showed that one can always construct a plane spanning tree and a 2-connected outerplane graph satisfying all of the constraints. García et al. [18] study the following question: Given a plane geometric tree *T* on a point set *S*, find a *T*-compatible plane spanning tree on *S* sharing the minimum number of edges with *T*. They show that this corresponds to finding a spanning forest of the visibility graph of *T* with the minimum number of components. For certain plane geometric paths, they prove that one can always find a spanning tree of the visibility graph.

2 Geometric Graphs with a Hugging Cycle

For a plane geometric graph $G = (V, E)$, a *hugging cycle* *C* is a plane geometric (simple) cycle with vertex set *V* such that the edges of *G* lie in the (closed) interior of *C*. Note that a plane geometric graph (or path) might not admit a hugging cycle or might admit more than one. We denote by $\text{Vis}^C(G)$ the restriction of $\text{Vis}(G)$ to the edges that lie in the (closed) interior of *C*.

An important concept towards our result is a *convexly hugging cycle*; a hugging cycle *C* of a geometric plane graph *G* such that all bounded faces of $G \cup C$ are convex. The main result in this section is the following theorem.

► **Theorem 1.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a plane geometric graph and let *C* be a convexly hugging cycle of *G*, and let $R \subset V$ be a set of vertices. Then, there is an $O(|V|)$ -time algorithm for deciding whether $\text{Vis}^C(G)$ contains a subgraph where exactly the vertices of *R* have odd degree.*

If *G* is a convex plane geometric graph, then the edges on the convex hull constitute a (in fact, unique) hugging cycle *C* and $\text{Vis}^C(G) = \text{Vis}(G)$, which, furthermore, is convexly hugging. We thus directly obtain the following corollary:


► **Corollary 2.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a convex plane geometric graph, and let $R \subseteq V$ be the set of unhappy vertices. There exists an $O(|V|)$ -time algorithm to decide whether (G, R) admits a solution, assuming the convex hull is part of the input.*

We remark that if G is a connected convex plane geometric graph, the convex hull can be computed in linear time [25]. In contrast, for disconnected convex plane geometric graphs, computing the hugging cycle is lower bounded by $\Omega(|V| \log(|V|))$ in the decision tree model of computing.

Now we present the proof of Theorem 1. Let C denote the convexly hugging cycle for G . In a first step, we consider a geometric subgraph G_f of G induced by a bounded (convex) face f of $G \cup C$, i.e., all edges are on the convex hull. To characterize the existence of solution sets for these cases, we distinguish three scenarios: (i) all edges are present, i.e., G_f is a cycle (Lemma 3); (ii) exactly one edge is missing, i.e., G_f is a path (Lemma 4); and (iii) at least two edges are missing, i.e., G_f is a collection of paths and isolated vertices (Lemma 5).

► **Lemma 3.** *Let $C = (V, E)$ be a convex plane geometric cycle and $R \subseteq V$. Then (C, R) admits a solution set if and only if $|R| = 0$ or $|R|$ is even and $V \setminus R$ contains two non-adjacent vertices.*

Proof. First, we show that the conditions are necessary. Suppose there exists a solution set H . As noted above, by the handshaking lemma, $|R|$ must be even. If $|V| \leq 3$ there exists a solution set if and only if $|R| = 0$. If $|V| > 3$, note that for any plane subgraph G^+ of $\text{Vis}(G)$, the weak dual graph $D(G \cup G^+)$ is a non-trivial tree; see Figure 2a for an illustration. Its (at least) two leaves certify two non-adjacent vertices which are not incident to any edge of G^+ . Applying this to H proves that there must exist at least two happy vertices which are not consecutive along G .



■ **Figure 2** Illustration for Lemma 3 and its proof. (a) The weak dual graph $D(G \cup G^+)$ (in orange) which is a tree. (b) A solution set consisting of a star with center v and vertices of R as leaves. (c) A solution set formed by a double star with centers u and w and vertices of R as leaves (where the edge uw might be removed if $|R_u|$ is even).


It remains to show that the conditions are also sufficient when $|V| > 3$. Assume that $|R|$ is even and there are at least two non-consecutive happy vertices. We consider two cases: either $V \setminus R$ contains three consecutive happy vertices or there exist two non-adjacent happy vertices u and w such that both paths in G between u and w contain an unhappy vertex.

In the first case, let v denote a vertex such that v and its neighbors are happy vertices. Then, connecting v with the vertices in R defines the solution set $H := \{vr \mid r \in R\}$; see Figure 2b for an illustration. It is easy to check that all degree constraints of H are met: v has even degree because $|R|$ is even and each vertex $r \in R$ has degree 1 in H .

In the second case, let u and w denote two non-adjacent unhappy vertices in R such that their clockwise neighbor in G is happy. Introducing the artificial chord uw splits $R \setminus \{u, w\}$ into two sets R_u and R_w containing the vertices in R on a clockwise uw -path and wu -path, respectively. We define $H := \{ur|r \in R_u\} \cup \{wr|r \in R_w\}$. If $|R_u|$ is odd (implying that $|R_w| = |R| - |R_u| - 2$ is odd as well), we add uw to H ; see also Figure 2c. It is easy to check that all degree constraints are met and H is a solution set. ◀

► **Lemma 4.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a convex geometric path with $|V| \geq 3$ and all edges on the boundary of the convex hull. Given $R \subseteq V$, there exists a solution set for (G, R) if and only if $|R|$ is even and $V \setminus R$ contains an internal vertex of G .*

Proof. Let s and t denote the two endpoints of G . In comparison to Lemma 3, there exists exactly one more variable of choice, namely to add or not to add the edge st in H , see also Figure 3. Let C denote the cycle obtained from G by adding st and define R' from R by switching the happiness status of s and t . Clearly, there exists a solution set H for (G, R) if and only if there exists a solution set for (C, R') or for (C, R) ; the edge st will belong to H in the first case and will not belong to H in the second case. Note that R and R' have the same parity. Thus, by Lemma 3, there exists a solution set H if and only if $|R| = |R'|$ is even and at least one of $V \setminus R$ and $V \setminus R'$ contains two non-adjacent vertices.



■ **Figure 3** Illustration for Lemma 4 and its proof. (a) A convex geometric path G and a set R of unhappy vertices (in red squares). (b) A solution set for the corresponding instance (C, R') . (c) A solution set for G .

If $V \setminus R$ or $V \setminus R'$ contains two non-adjacent vertices, then clearly at least one of them is an internal vertex w of G . Now suppose that there is an internal happy vertex $w \in V \setminus R$ (and $|R|$ even). If $|V| = 3$, either $|R| = 0$ and hence (C, R) has a solution set or $R = \{s, t\}$ and thus $|R'| = 0$ and (C, R') has a solution set. If $|V| > 3$, w is not adjacent to s or to t , say s . If $s \in V \setminus R$, s and w are a certificate for an solution set of (C, R) and if $s \in R$, s and w are a certificate for an solution set of (C, R') , implying that there is also a solution set for (G, R) . ◀


► **Lemma 5.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a collection of at least two geometric paths (could be singleton sets) on a convex point set with $|V| \geq 3$ and all edges on the boundary of the convex hull. Given $R \subseteq V$, there exists a solution set for (G, R) if and only if $|R|$ is even.*

Proof. As before, $|R|$ even is clearly necessary. It remains to show that this is sufficient. Let e_1 and e_2 denote two edges of the convex hull that do not belong to G . If $|V| = 3$ and $|R| = 2$, H consists either of the edge between the vertices in R (if this edge does not belong to G) or of e_1 and e_2 . Hence, we assume that $|V| \geq 4$. In this case, we can choose a vertex

v_i from e_i for $i = 1, 2$ such that v_1 and v_2 are not adjacent. By adding or not adding e_i to H , we can ensure that v_i does not belong to R . Then, Lemma 3 guarantees the existence of a solution set. ◀

Using Lemmas 3–5, we present a linear-time algorithm for any plane geometric graph with a convexly hugging cycle. To this end, we use the concept of the weak dual. The *weak dual* of a plane graph is the plane graph that has a vertex for each bounded face and an edge between two vertices if and only if the corresponding faces share an edge. For a plane geometric graph $G = (V, E)$ with a convexly hugging cycle C , the weak dual graph of $G \cup C$ is a tree since it is the weak dual of a biconnected outerplanar graph. For clarity, we sometimes refer to the vertices of the weak dual as the faces they correspond to.

Proof of Theorem 1. Consider the convex weak dual graph $D(G)$ of $G \cup C$. As remarked above, $G \cup C$ is a biconnected outerplanar geometric graph and thus, $D(G)$ is a tree. We root $D(G)$ at a leaf f_0 and orient all edges towards f_0 , making $D(G)$ an in-arborescence. See Figure 4a for an illustration on a convex point set, and note that our proof holds in the more general case of plane geometric graphs with a convexly hugging cycle.




■ **Figure 4** (a) A plane geometric graph G , a convexly hugging cycle (gray), and their dual tree $D(G)$ rooted at f_0 . (b) A solution set (dashed and solid blue). The highlighted edges (pink) are marked flexible in the execution of the algorithm.

For every face f that is not the root, we define the *connector edge* uv to be the edge of G that f shares with its parent in $D(G)$. At the root f_0 , let the connector edge be an edge of C incident to this face. Note that since f_0 is a leaf of $D(G)$ such an edge exists and it is not shared with the child face.

The idea of the algorithm is to consider $D(G)$ bottom up, taking care at each step of a face f of $G \cup C$ whose children have already been processed. For a face f (different from the root) with connector edge uv , we define $\Pi(f, p_u, p_v)$ to be the problem asking whether the geometric graph corresponding to the subtree of $D(G)$ rooted at f has a solution that satisfies the given parity constraints, where the parity constraints at u and v are replaced by p_u and p_v .

To solve $\Pi(f, p_u, p_v)$, we use bottom-up dynamic programming in the tree $D(G)$. Note that the graph G_f restricted to face f has all edges on its convex hull. Hence, Lemmas 3–5 characterize when there exists a solution set. Note that these lemmas are constructive and provide a solution set in linear time when it exists. Consider a child f' of f with connector edge wx ; we assume that problem $\Pi(f', p_w, p_x)$ has already been solved for all possible values of p_w, p_x . We call f' and its connector edge *inflexible* if there is only one set of parities p_w, p_x such that $\Pi(f', p_w, p_x)$ has a solution, otherwise we call them *flexible*. The example in

Figure 5 shows that it is necessary to do the book-keeping of flexible faces; otherwise we may falsely conclude that there exists no solution set.



■ **Figure 5** A convex plane geometric tree T (black), a set R (red), and the unique solution set (in gray). In it, u and v are not made happy within the bottom face, while it is trivial to satisfy that face locally. This shows that just answering whether a face can be satisfied locally is not enough information.

Case (i): If f has no flexible child, then the vertices on face f have no choice. Thus, we can immediately determine whether $\Pi(f, p_u, p_v)$ has a solution by applying Lemmas 3–5 on the instance in f to fulfill the parity constraints from $\Pi(f, p_u, p_v)$.

Case (ii): If f has at most two flexible children, say with connector edges wx and yz , we consider all at most sixteen choices for $p_w, p_x, p_y, p_z \in \{0, 1\}$. For each of them, we first check whether there is a solution in the children with these parity constraints. (Note that we only need to consider four choices, because the number of unhappy vertices in any problem needs to be even for there to exist a solution.) Then, for each of these choices that is valid for the children, we produce an instance for f where we adjust the happiness status of w, x, y, z so that the combination with p_w, p_x, p_y, p_z gives the desired parities. This instance can be checked using Lemmas 3–5.

Case (iii): If f has at least three flexible children, we show that $\Pi(f, p_u, p_v)$ always has a solution set if p_u, p_v are such that the total number of unhappy vertices is even; otherwise there cannot be a solution. If f has multiple flexible children, trying all parity combinations for the vertices could lead to exponentially many cases. We are saved by the following observation: when a face contains at least three flexible edges, then there is a choice for them that produces two non-consecutive vertices on f that do not need to change their parities in f to satisfy $\Pi(f, p_u, p_v)$. Lemma 3 then ensures that any of the two options of parity constraints for u and v such that the total number of unhappy vertices in the problem is even, are satisfiable in f .

For a face f , if $\Pi(f, p_u, p_v)$ admits a solution for more than one value of p_u, p_v (there are at most two such problems that can be solvable), f and the connector edge uv are marked flexible and, if $f \neq f_0$, we proceed to a new face. For an example consider Figure 4b. If at any face none of the problems admits a solution we conclude that no solution set for (G, R) exists. If we reached the root f_0 and the problem $\Pi(f_0, p_u, p_v)$ where p_u, p_v match the original parity constraints has a solution, we conclude that (G, R) admits a solution set. Note that using this algorithm it is easy to efficiently construct a solution set for (G, R) if one exists.

The correctness of the algorithm is based on the following fact. Let $uv \in E$ be the connector edge for f . Then, uv separates G into two subgraphs, one of which contains the vertices in f and all the descendant faces. Thus, uv defines two subinstances of the problem that only overlap in u and v . There exists a solution set for (G, R) if and only if those

subinstances admit solutions that together satisfy the parity constraints of u and v . This implies that the algorithm checks all the possibilities, as it keeps all possible parities of u and v in valid solutions of the subinstance considered so far.

It remains to show that the constructed solutions are valid. Processing face f requires to satisfy all the parity constraints from R on all the vertices in f except for u and v . The last check in the root face f_0 enforces the parity constraints from R on all its vertices. Thus, for each vertex, the last face containing it enforces the correct parity.

The time spent by the algorithm in each face is linear in its size. Thus, given the convexly hugging cycle C , $D(G)$ can be computed in linear time and the algorithm runs in $O(|V|)$ time. ◀

3 Plane Geometric Paths


In this section, we efficiently solve the decision problem for plane geometric paths.

► **Theorem 6.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a plane geometric path and let $R \subseteq V$. There exists an algorithm to decide whether (G, R) admits a solution set in $O(|V| \log |V|)$ time.*

To prove this result, we consider two cases. Either the path is *universally happy*, i.e., there exist solution sets for any unhappy subset R of even cardinality, or the path has a particular structure (called *pseudo-convexity*) which allows us to use our algorithm for Theorem 1.

3.1 Universal Happiness

Universal happiness requires $\text{Vis}(G)$ to be connected: otherwise there exists no solution set when R consist of an odd number of vertices from two different components of $\text{Vis}(G)$; see Figure 6.




■ **Figure 6** An example in which $\text{Vis}(G)$ is not connected and an even set of two unhappy vertices (square) that does not admit a solution.

In the next lemma we show that the existence of a plane spanning tree in $\text{Vis}(G)$ is sufficient as long as $|R|$ is even. The proof uses standard arguments (for example, in the context of T-joins, and also similar to Theorem 3 in [21]).

► **Lemma 7.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a plane geometric graph such that $\text{Vis}(G)$ has a plane spanning tree T . Then for all $R \subseteq V$ with $|R|$ even (G, R) admits a solution set.*


Proof. Consider a fixed but arbitrary $R \subseteq V$ with $|R|$ even. We partition R into pairs. For each such pair (u, v) , we consider the unique uv -path P_{uv} in T . Augmenting G by P_{uv} satisfies the parity constraints for u and v without altering the happiness status of the other vertices. To construct a solution set we can iterate over the paths P_{uv} swapping their edges. More formally, let H^m denote the edge multi-set of the union of all these paths P_{uv} . Deleting

two copies of an edge maintains the parities of the degrees of all vertices. Consequently, we can define a solution set H for (G, R) as the subset of H^m consisting on the edges of odd multiplicity; see Figure 7 for an illustration. ◀



■ **Figure 7** Illustration for the proof of Lemma 7. (a) A plane geometric graph G (in black) and a plane spanning tree T of $\text{Vis}(G)$ (in gray). (b) A set R and paths (in dashed red) between (an arbitrary partition of R into) pairs of R in T . (c) The symmetric difference of the paths yields a solution set (in red).

García et al. [18] give a characterization of the existence of a plane spanning tree in the visibility graph for the case of a path. To use it, we introduce some notation. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a plane geometric path, and let q_0, \dots, q_{k-1} be the vertices on the convex hull of V ordered clockwise. Adding an edge $e = q_i q_{i+1} \in \text{Vis}(G)$ to G creates a unique face (indices are considered modulo k). Its boundary is a geometric graph that we call *pocket*: it consists of the edge e together with the subpath of G connecting the endpoints of e . We say that a pocket $P = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_s$ with $v_0 = q_i, v_s = q_{i+1}$ for some i is *pseudo-convex* if it does not contain an endpoint of G in its interior and it is either convex or every reflex vertex $v_j \in P$ satisfies the condition that the rays obtained by extending the edges $v_{j-1}v_j$ and $v_{j+1}v_j$ (indices considered modulo s) intersect P for the first time at $e = q_i q_{i+1}$. Note that if G is pseudo-convex, its two endpoints lie on the convex hull. Figure 8 illustrates a path and its pockets. If every pocket of G is pseudo-convex, we say that G is pseudo-convex.



■ **Figure 8** Example of a path and its pockets. While pocket P (with blue interior) is pseudo-convex, pocket P' (with red interior) is not.

We exploit the following fact which has been showed by García et al. [18] using a slightly different language.

► **Lemma 8** (Theorem 3 and Remark 2 in [18]). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a plane geometric path. $\text{Vis}(G)$ has a plane spanning tree if and only if G is not pseudo-convex.*


Using Lemma 8 and our tools of the proof for Theorem 6, we show in Section 3.3 that the sufficient condition in Lemma 7 is also necessary.

► **Theorem 9.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a plane geometric path. This geometric graph G is universally happy if and only if $\text{Vis}(G)$ has a plane spanning tree, or equivalently, G is not pseudo-convex.*

3.2 Tight Hulls and Proof of Theorem 6

Our main tools to prove Theorem 6 are Theorem 1 and Lemmas 7 and 8. The last ingredient is to bridge the gap between pseudo-convexity and convexity.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a plane geometric pseudo-convex path and consider a (pseudo-convex) pocket P induced by some edge $e = q_i q_{i+1} \in \text{Vis}(G)$. Let r_1, \dots, r_s be the reflex vertices of P ordered counterclockwise. The *tight hull* of P consists of the edges $q_i r_1, r_1 r_2, \dots, r_{s-1} r_s, r_s q_{i+1}$; see Figure 9 for an illustration. Each edge on the tight hull of P defines a unique face, creating a *subpocket* of P . García et al. [18] show that this tight hull always exists and each subpocket is convex (Lemma 4.i in [18]). Replacing the convex hull edge of every pocket of G by the tight hull of the pocket, one gets the tight hull of G .



■ **Figure 9** Example of a pseudo-convex path and the tight hull of a pocket (with blue interior), its subpockets (with darker blue interior), and the tight hull of G forming a hugging cycle (in gray).

► **Lemma 10.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a plane geometric pseudo-convex path. Then the tight hull T of G is a convexly hugging cycle.*

Proof. By definition, the edges of G lie in the (closed) interior of T . We now show that T contains all vertices. Suppose there exists a vertex v in the strict interior of T . Then v is contained in the interior of some pocket of G , guaranteeing that the pocket and thus G are not pseudo-convex. We note that T is a cycle: by construction it is connected and each vertex has degree 2. Finally, the convexity of all bounded faces of $G \cup T$ follows from the convexity of the subpockets. ◀


Looking for a solution set of a pseudo-convex path, we now show that we may restrict our attention to the tight hull T , more precisely, to $\text{Vis}^T(G)$, the restriction of $\text{Vis}(G)$ to the tight hull and its interior.

► **Lemma 11.** *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a plane geometric pseudo-convex path, T its tight hull, and let $R \subseteq V$. If (G, R) allows a solution set H then there also exists a solution set H' within $\text{Vis}^T(G)$.*

Proof. We distinguish two types of *unwanted* edges in H : (i) edges crossing the tight hull and (ii) edges in the exterior of the tight hull (not on its boundary).

Let uv be an unwanted edge of Type (i) in a pocket P of G . Recall that subpockets are convex. Since uv is part of a solution set, it can cross at most two tight hull edges. Let e be the edge of the tight hull crossed by uv such that the subpocket P° of e includes u . By convexity of P° , vertex u is convex in P° (and in P); the other vertex v lies outside P° . For an illustration see Figure 10a.

Among all such edges of Type (i), we consider the edge uv that minimizes the number of vertices on the subpath π of G between u and v . Let w_u be the first reflex vertex (of P) encountered when walking along π from u towards v , and let w_v be the first reflex vertex (of P) encountered when walking along π from v towards u . If v itself is a reflex vertex,



■ **Figure 10** Illustration for the proof of Lemma 11. (a) An edge uv of Type (i) crossing the tight hull (in solid red) and the edges replacing it (in dashed red). (b) Edges from H crossing replacement edges would be of Type (i) and define a shorter subpath in G , contradicting the choice of uv .

then let $w_v = v$. Note that, by convexity of the subpockets, we have $uw_u \in \text{Vis}(G)$ and $vw_v \in \text{Vis}(G)$.


Let $w_u = r_1, r_2, \dots, r_\ell = w_v$ be the reflex vertices of P belonging to π , see also Figure 10a. We aim to replace the solution set H by $H \Delta \{uw_u, r_1r_2, \dots, r_{\ell-1}r_\ell, w_vv, vu\}$, where Δ denotes the symmetric difference. We show that none of the replacement edges intersect an edge of H .

To this end, we show that by the choice of uv , the edges uw_u and vw_v do not intersect any edge of H . Any edge of H crossing uw_u but not uv has to have one endpoint $x \in \pi[u, w_u]$ distinct from both u and w_u , and one endpoint y not in $\pi[u, w_u]$. If y belongs to $\pi[w_u, v]$, then xy is of Type (i) and thus contradicts the minimality of uv . For an illustration, see Figure 10b. If y is outside of π , then xy crosses uv , which is not possible since both edges were part of the solution set H . Analogously, we have $vw_v \in \text{Vis}(G)$.

The situation is similar when considering a replacement edge $r_i r_{i+1}$. Suppose that edge $h \in H$ intersects $r_i r_{i+1}$. Then h is of Type (i). If both vertices of h belong to π then h contradicts the minimality of uv . Otherwise, h has exactly one endpoint not belonging to π , but then h must cross the closed curve $uv \cup \pi$, contradicting the properties of H .

Thus, we replace the solution set H by $H \Delta \{uw_u, r_1r_2, \dots, r_{\ell-1}r_\ell, w_vv, vu\}$ and obtain a non-crossing edge set. Because $\{uw_u, r_1r_2, \dots, r_{\ell-1}r_\ell, w_vv, vu\}$ forms a cycle, all degree parities are maintained. Moreover, H contains fewer unwanted edges of Type (i). Repeating this procedure, we obtain a solution set H without unwanted edges of Type (i).

Suppose now that H contains an unwanted edge of Type (ii) between u and v in a pocket P ; see Figure 11.



■ **Figure 11** Illustration for the proof of Lemma 11. An edge uv of Type (ii) in the interior of the tight hull.

Let π denote the path on the tight hull between u and v that lies inside P . Since uv is not on the tight hull, π must contain other vertices apart from u and v . The absence of Type (i) edges guarantees that π does not cross any edge from H . Thus, since $\pi \cup \{uv\}$ forms a cycle, replacing H by $H \Delta (\pi \cup \{uv\})$ results in a solution set with fewer edges of Type (ii). Repeating this procedure, yields the lemma. ◀

Proof of Theorem 6. First we check whether G is pseudo-convex: Using existing ray


shooting techniques in polygons [11, 20], the first intersection point on a ray can be computed in $O(\log |V|)$ time. For $O(|V|)$ reflex vertices, we obtain $O(|V| \log |V|)$ time, which also bounds the preprocessing time required. If G is not pseudo-convex, then Lemma 8 guarantees the existence of a plane spanning tree in $\text{Vis}(G)$ and G is universally happy by Lemma 7. If G is pseudo-convex, the tight hull T can be computed in linear time by considering the vertices in the order given by the path. By Lemma 10, T is a convexly hugging cycle and Lemma 11 guarantees a solution set in $\text{Vis}^T(G)$ if there exists a solution set in $\text{Vis}(G)$. Hence, we may use the linear-time algorithm given in the proof of Theorem 1 to decide whether there exists a solution set. ◀

3.3 Proof of Theorem 9

We are now ready to show that a plane geometric path is universally happy if and only if its visibility graph has a plane spanning tree.

Proof of Theorem 9. By Lemma 7, we know that the existence of a plane spanning tree in $\text{Vis}(G)$ implies universal happiness of G . It remains to show that it is a necessary condition.

Suppose $\text{Vis}(G)$ does not contain a plane spanning tree. Then, by Lemma 8, G is pseudo-convex. By Lemma 10, the tight hull T of G is a hugging cycle and by Lemma 11, we may restrict our attention to edges in $\text{Vis}^T(G)$. We now construct a set R without a solution set by considering the weak dual tree $D(G)$ of the outerplane graph $G \cup T$. Root $D(G)$ at an arbitrary leaf face f_0 . Note that $D(G)$ is a path on vertices f_0, f_1, \dots, f_k . For an illustration, consider Figure 12. In particular, we consider the faces in reverse order, beginning from the other leaf face f_k (as the algorithm of Theorem 1 would do in order to compute a solution set or decide that none exist).



■ **Figure 12** Illustration for the proof of Theorem 9. (a) A pseudo-convex path G and its weak dual tree $D(G)$ of $G \cup T$. (b) A set of unhappy vertices R that has no solution set.

As before, we denote the dual edge of $f_i f_{i-1}$ as the connector edge of face f_i . For a face $f \neq f_0$, let V_f be the set of vertices on its boundary and uv its connector edge. By renaming, we may assume that u is incident to the unique edge shared by f and the tight hull. For $f = f_0$, let u denote the endpoint of G in f_0 and v its neighbor in G . For $f = f_k$, we define $R := V_f$ if $|V_f|$ is even and $R := V_f \setminus \{u\}$ if $|V_f|$ is odd. Clearly, the vertices $V_f \setminus \{u, v\}$ can only be satisfied by edges inside f . By Lemma 4, there exists a solution set inside f satisfying $V_f \setminus \{u, v\}$ only if v serves as the happy inner vertex. More precisely, the unique way to satisfy $V_f \setminus \{u, v\}$ inside f is by adding the star with center u and leaves $V_f \setminus \{u, v\}$. To see that, note that any plane triangulation of f has at least two vertices of degree 2. The only choices for these vertices are v and the neighbor of u on the tight hull of f . It follows that the connector vertices u and v are thus guaranteed to be unhappy after inserting edges in f_k to satisfy the vertices of $V_{f_k} \setminus \{u, v\}$.

Processing the faces in the order $f_k, f_{k-1}, f_{k-2}, \dots, f_0$, we now add vertices of G to R . To this end, let $U_f := \bigcup_{f' \text{ after } f \text{ in } D(G)} V_{f'}$ denote the set of all previously considered vertices.

For a face f , we add $V_f \setminus U_f$ to R if $|V_f|$ is even and $V_f \setminus \{u\} \cup U_f$ otherwise. This maintains the invariant that u and v of a face f are unhappy in any solution set satisfying $U_f \setminus \{u, v\}$ in the later faces. It follows that all vertices of V_f are unhappy and thus for any face $f \neq f_0$ in any solution set, all vertices in $V_f \setminus \{v\}$ must be connected to u . Finally, in f_0 every vertex in $V_f \setminus \{u\}$ is unhappy. Consequently, no inner vertex is happy, and by Lemma 4, there exists no solution set. ◀

4 Conclusion

We showed how to decide in polynomial time whether a plane geometric path can be augmented (with straight-line edges and without creating crossings) to meet some given parity constraints of the vertices. The main question that remains is whether an analogous result exists for plane geometric trees. More restricted versions of this problem are also open, in particular when set of unhappy vertices consists of all the vertices or all the odd-degree vertices.

References

- 1 Manuel Abellanas, Alfredo García Olaverri, Ferran Hurtado, Javier Tejel, and Jorge Urrutia. Augmenting the connectivity of geometric graphs. *Comput. Geom.*, 40(3):220–230, 2008. doi:10.1016/j.comgeo.2007.09.001.
- 2 Florian Adriaens and Aristides Gionis. Diameter minimization by shortcutting with degree constraints. In Xingquan Zhu, Sanjay Ranka, My T. Thai, Takashi Washio, and Xindong Wu, editors, *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM 2022)*, pages 843–848. IEEE, 2022. doi:10.1109/ICDM54844.2022.00095.
- 3 Oswin Aichholzer, Thomas Hackl, Michael Hoffmann, Alexander Pilz, Günter Rote, Bettina Speckmann, and Birgit Vogtenhuber. Plane graphs with parity constraints. *Graphs Comb.*, 30(1):47–69, 2014. doi:10.1007/s00373-012-1247-y.
- 4 Hugo A. Akitaya, Rajasekhar Inkulu, Torrie L. Nichols, Diane L. Souvaine, Csaba D. Tóth, and Charles R. Winston. Minimum weight connectivity augmentation for planar straight-line graphs. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 789:50–63, 2019. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2018.05.031.
- 5 Marwan Al-Jubeh, Mashhood Ishaque, Kristóf Rédei, Diane L. Souvaine, Csaba D. Tóth, and Pavel Valtr. Augmenting the edge connectivity of planar straight line graphs to three. *Algorithmica*, 61(4):971, 2011. doi:10.1007/s00453-011-9551-0.
- 6 Noga Alon, András Gyárfás, and Miklós Ruszinkó. Decreasing the diameter of bounded degree graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 35(3):161–172, 2000. doi:10/b39gzn.
- 7 Víctor Álvarez. Parity-constrained triangulations with Steiner points. *Graphs Comb.*, 31(1):35–57, 2015. doi:10.1007/s00373-013-1389-6.
- 8 András A. Benczúr and David R. Karger. Augmenting undirected edge connectivity in $\tilde{O}(n^2)$ time. *J. Algorithms*, 37(1):2–36, 2000. doi:10.1006/jagm.2000.1093.
- 9 Juan C. Catana, Alfredo García Olaverri, Javier Tejel, and Jorge Urrutia. Plane augmentation of plane graphs to meet parity constraints. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 386:125513, 2020. doi:10.1016/j.amc.2020.125513.
- 10 Ruoxu Cen, Jason Li, and Debmalya Panigrahi. Augmenting edge connectivity via isolating cuts. In *Proc. 2022 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2022)*, pages 3237–3252. SIAM, 2022. doi:10.1137/1.9781611977073.127.
- 11 Bernard Chazelle, Herbert Edelsbrunner, Michelangelo Grigni, Leonidas Guibas, John Hershberger, Micha Sharir, and Jack Snoeyink. Ray shooting in polygons using geodesic triangulations. *Algorithmica*, 12(1):54–68, 1994. doi:10.1007/BF01377183.
- 12 Fan R. K. Chung and Michael R. Garey. Diameter bounds for altered graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 8(4):511–534, 1984. doi:10.1002/jgt.3190080408.

- 13 Konrad K. Dabrowski, Petr A. Golovach, Pim van 't Hof, and Daniël Paulusma. Editing to Eulerian graphs. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 82(2):213–228, 2016. doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2015.10.003.
- 14 Jack Edmonds and Ellis L. Johnson. Matching, euler tours and the chinese postman. *Mathematical Programming*, 5(1):88–124, 1973. doi:10.1007/BF01580113.
- 15 Kapali P. Eswaran and R. Endre Tarjan. Augmentation problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 5(4):653–665, 1976. doi:10.1137/0205044.
- 16 András Frank. Augmenting graphs to meet edge-connectivity requirements. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 5(1):25–53, 1992. doi:10.1137/0405003.
- 17 Fabrizio Frati, Serge Gaspers, Joachim Gudmundsson, and Luke Mathieson. Augmenting graphs to minimize the diameter. *Algorithmica*, 72(4):995–1010, 2015. doi:10.1007/s00453-014-9886-4.
- 18 Alfredo García, Clemens Huemer, Ferran Hurtado, and Javier Tejel. Compatible spanning trees. *Comput. Geom.*, 47(5):563–584, 2014. doi:10.1016/j.comgeo.2013.12.009.
- 19 Alfredo García, Ferran Hurtado, Matias Korman, Inês Matos, Maria Saumell, Rodrigo I. Silveira, Javier Tejel, and Csaba D. Tóth. Geometric biplane graphs II: Graph augmentation. *Graphs Comb.*, 31(2):427–452, 2015. doi:10.1007/s00373-015-1547-0.
- 20 Leonidas J. Guibas, John Hershberger, and Jack Snoeyink. Compact interval trees: a data structure for convex hulls. *Int. J. Comput. Geom. Appl.*, 1(1):1–22, 1991. doi:10.1142/S0218195991000025.
- 21 F. Hadlock. Finding a maximum cut of a planar graph in polynomial time. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 4(3):221–225, 1975. doi:10.1137/0204019.
- 22 Goos Kant and Hans L. Bodlaender. Planar graph augmentation problems. In *Proc. 2nd Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures (WADS 1991)*, volume 519 of *LNCS*, pages 286–298. Springer, 1991. doi:10.1007/BFb0028270.
- 23 Evangelos Kranakis, Danny Krizanc, Oscar Morales-Ponce, and Ladislav Stacho. Bounded length, 2-edge augmentation of geometric planar graphs. *Discret. Math. Algorithms Appl.*, 4(3), 2012. doi:10.1142/S179383091250036X.
- 24 Mei-ko Kwan. Graphic programming using odd or even points. *Chinese Math*, 1:273–277, 1960.
- 25 Avraham A. Melkman. On-line construction of the convex hull of a simple polyline. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 25(1):11–12, 1987. doi:10.1016/0020-0190(87)90086-X.
- 26 C. ST. J. A. Nash-Williams. On orientations, connectivity and odd-vertex-pairings in finite graphs. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 12:555–567, 1960. doi:10.4153/CJM-1960-049-6.
- 27 Alexander Pilz, Jonathan Rollin, Lena Schlipf, and André Schulz. Augmenting geometric graphs with matchings. In *Proc. 28th International Symposium on Graph Drawing and Network Visualization (GD 2020)*, volume 12590 of *LNCS*, pages 490–504. Springer, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-68766-3_38.
- 28 Ján Plesník. Minimum block containing a given graph. *Arch. Math.*, 27(6):668–672, 1976.
- 29 Ignaz Rutter and Alexander Wolff. Augmenting the connectivity of planar and geometric graphs. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 16(2):599–628, 2012. doi:10.7155/jgaa.00275.
- 30 Csaba D. Tóth. Connectivity augmentation in planar straight line graphs. *Eur. J. Comb.*, 33(3):408–425, 2012. doi:10.1016/j.ejc.2011.09.002.